

Janice K. Brewer  
Governor

Bryan Martyn  
Executive Director



#### Board Members

Walter D. Armer, Jr., Vail, *Chair*  
Maria Baier, State Land Commissioner, *Vice Chair*  
Kay Daggett, Sierra Vista  
Alan Everett, Sedona  
Larry Landry, Phoenix  
William C. Scalzo, Phoenix  
Tracey Westerhausen, Phoenix

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING  
Of  
THE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ADVISORY GROUP  
(OHVAG)  
Of  
THE ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD**

Notice is hereby given pursuant to A.R.S. §41-511.22 to members of the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG) and the general public that the Group will hold a meeting open to the public on **Monday, August 27, 2012 beginning at 9:00 a.m. at the Arizona State Parks Board Room, 1300 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007**. Public comment will be taken. The Group may go into Executive Session for the purpose of obtaining legal advice from the State Parks Assistant Attorney General on any of the agenda items pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431 et seq. Items on the Agenda may be discussed out of order, unless they have been assigned a time certain. Public comment will be taken. The Group will discuss and may take action on the following matters:

#### **MINUTES**

##### **A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:**

Chair John Savino called the meeting to order at 9:25 a.m.

Roll Call:

Chair John Savino	Present
David Moore	Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
Pete Pfeifer	American Motorcycle Association
Don French	White Mountain Open Trail Association

Members Absent: Thomas McArthur, Rebecca Antle

##### **B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF**

Staff present: Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Resources & Public Programs,  
Paul Katz, Attorney General Office representing State Parks

Public: Jeff Gursh, Arizona Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition / Arizona Trail  
Riders

\*Director Bryan Martyn and Deputy Director: Kent Ennis, Arizona State Parks,  
arrived at approximately 11:30 a.m.

## **1.OHVAG Chair John Savino read mission statement**

**The Statewide OHV Program Mission is to develop and enhance statewide off-highway vehicle recreation opportunities, and develop educational programs that promote resource protection, social responsibility, and interagency cooperation.**

### **C. CALL TO THE PUBLIC – None**

John Savino:

At this point I would like to have; I'm going to hold off on the call to the Public until we get to the specific topic that comes up and if at that time with our audience present if you would like to say something please let me know.

### **D. REPORTS – NONE**

#### **1. OHV Program Partner Reports: None**

John Savino:

Reports we have Off Highway Vehicle partner reports. We don't have anyone present from any organizations, none scheduled, and sometimes they show up late.

#### **2. Staff Reports:**

Doris Pulsifer reported on the hiring status of the OHV Coordinator and OHV Planner II positions:

John Savino:

None scheduled, I would like to have that changed because we asked Paul, our Attorney General to give us a follow up on what we were talking about with AORCC and the Arizona Revised Statute involving that in our last meeting. Paul if you would like to take over at this time I would appreciate it.

Paul Katz:

That's fine and we need to do this in an executive session and what I'm going to say is stuff that the public shouldn't hear. I did respond to Bryan Martyn, Parks Director did ask me to follow up with respect to the inquiry that Pete Pfeifer made of him. Regarding the history of AORCC and OHVAG, what I'm going to do is, I didn't run a copy of this because I sent it to Bryan and I felt that he would distribute it to you folks and I'm not being critical. But, I will just read it to you because; it's easier than my trying to recite. But, I did have an opportunity to review quite a bit of legislative history and going to the tax, ARS or Arizona Revised Statute §41-51125 the AORCC statute was promulgated by the legislator in 1965. It was amended to require AORCC to establish grant criteria, review grant applications, and determine the amount of funding if any for each grant project with respect to the quote Off Highway Vehicle Recreation fund, effective 1989 and there are the two other funds that they were responsible for doing similar activity. It should be noted that the legislation required independent AR review of the Off Highway Recreation fund grants at a time when OHVAG was still a legislatively mandated advisory group. Senate bill 1271 was signed into law by the Governor on April 16, 1996; this legislation repealed several councils, boards, and committees and included the repeal of the legislation creating OHVAG. With the repeal of

ARS section §28-2807 which was the old OHVAG statute, OHVAG was no longer appointed by the governor and ceased to exist on May 16, 1996. Parks Board reestablished OHVAG as an advisory group to the Board there have been no substantive amendments, ARS section §41-511.25(b)(3), which is the requirement for AORCC review since 1989 which is the year that in which AORCC review of Off Highway Recreation fund grants became mandatory it must also be kept in mind that the purpose of the Parks Board pursuant to ARS §41-511.03 is to select, acquire, establish and maintain areas of natural features, scenic beauty, historical, and scientific interest, and the zoos and the botanical gardens for educational purposes and pleasure recreation health of people. And OHVAG's mission is to maximize the lawful use of off highway vehicles within our state parks and adjacent public lands and that's essentially what I told Bryan.

John Savino:

Why does it say...? And I'm not an attorney and I never grew up wanting to be one and I never claimed to be one but why does it say, on this last part it says July 1, 2012. How's that?

David Moore:

What revisions were made on that day?

Paul Katz:

There were revisions, I could research that, but, they didn't revise that particular section. I went back to '89 and I might even have it, I don't know if I brought the '89 statute with me or not. But they didn't amend that section B, 3.

John Savino:

So then that wasn't touched?

Paul Katz:

B-3 hasn't been touched, at all since 1989, it reads the same way today, I don't know if I brought it with me or not. My secretary Debbie can run copies of that...

John Savino:

I trust you...

Paul Katz:

I had the same concerns as you and I can run copies of that for you... I had the same concern and what I was able to find and all I have, my secretary, Debbie was out sick and I was gone most of last week and all I have is the statute as it existed for off highway vehicle advisory group duties when it existed and then I have the repeal statute. But I don't have and I also had run a copy of the 1989 AORCC statutes.

John Savino:

Paul, and I agree and I trust you so essentially what I'm hearing is that it's been in effect since way back when, when the new Director came on board, he essentially went back and went okay we're going to do... For whatever reason we haven't been doing it forever. Okay. And we can't go and we can't

correct the past but according to what statutes are that's basically the new Director is following, on this thing.

Paul Katz:

Okay

John Savino:

Okay, so are there any questions among or any comments.

Pete Pfeifer:

The only question that I have is can I still get that in writing so that I can pass that on to my constituents?

Paul Katz:

I don't see that there should be any problems with the way that I was doing it with Bryan and he might want me to revise it. But, I would essentially say the same thing.

John Savino:

Well then what I would like to have done then is ask staff to ask Director Bryan Martyn: to pass this on to and to email this to every OHVAG member.

Paul Katz:

And he'll either forward this to you, what I sent to him or I can resend it without the string of emails that went back and forth between everybody.

John Savino:

Any other questions?

Pete Pfeifer:

The only question that I have now is somebody brought AORCC back in the picture. Was that Bryan?

John Savino:

Well according to him it was when he talked to us, when we had that meeting, yes, he said that he wanted to just get it, I hope he follows it and I have to trust him, I hope he follows it on all the different aspects to follow because he's bringing back in saying this is the way it is supposed to be so that's why I'm doing it. The same thing happened when he took it to the Board to get it to where we're not a decision making group, we're just an advisory group. He said he was just trying to get everything in order and do it legally. So according, my beliefs are that's what he is doing here.

Pete Pfeifer:

Okay.

Paul Katz:

One thing that we have tried to do just as a point of, both Parks Board as well as my recommendation was to continue to keep AORCC just as an advisory board the statute is, the way it reads is, basically says that their supposed to be developing the grant criteria and making the decisions. But, it's in conflict

with the statute that creates the trail plan, and in conflict that creates the Parks Board. But we are just treating them as an advisory board rather than having any mandatory authority to tell Parks how to appropriate OHVAG's monies.

David Moore:

Other than the director of Game and Fish, and the director of Parks can you tell us who the rest of the members are?

Paul Katz:

Do we have the statute that I brought to the... It's in the statute; I don't know unfortunately all of my statute references...

John Savino:

I have it here, basically the advisory group, the AORCC serves in an advisory capacity to the Arizona State Parks Board and it goes on to basically say..

David Moore:

I knew what the criteria was but.

John Savino:

Here we go, William Schwind, Parks and Recreation, he's a Glendale Parks and Recreation Director...

Doris Pulsifer:

Casa Grande

John Savino:

And basically that's what you have there...

Paul Katz:

It says of the three members appointed by the governor shall be professional, full time Parks and Recreation department directors of a county, city, or town and no two shall reside in the same county? Two members appointed by the Governor shall be by the general public and each shall have broad experience in outdoor recreation. Of the five appointed members no more than two shall reside in the same county and there's also two other members are the Director of Game and Fish and the Director of Parks.

John Savino:

Let me ask you something. Can one of our members, if you are sitting on this board can you become a member of AORCC also?

Paul Katz:

If you can convince the governor that you are worthy, I don't see any problems there.

Pete Pfeifer:

And see before OHVAG existed that's what they had and that was the criteria and basically get some people together that knew about OHVAG or recreation.

David Moore:

Right.

Pete Pfeifer:

Then they created OHVAG that specialized in for motorized recreation because they found that they needed it, they had a need.

David Moore:

They needed more input.

Pete Pfeifer:

That's the only reason that they created a separate group. Okay, and that's when the governor said okay I need to see the best experts we have in Arizona on this group OHVAG. Okay, so we get a clear understanding of what motorized vehicle recreation is all about what we need and all that stuff like that.

John Savino:

Now how can we... Okay first of all what I would like to do at this time if I may since we have some empty seats up here and we only have one person in the audience and this person does have, he helped write the bill... Would you like... Jeff, I would like to have you come up and sit on the board now. With that in mind, unless you are asked a specific question, you need to stay out of it?

Jeff Gursh:

Yes.

John Savino:

But at least you can hear a little better, maybe get some expertise advice on this. Another words shut up until I tell you to talk.

Jeff Gursh:

That's alright, no problem, I'm just looking for the comfortable chair.

John Savino:

How can, this is set in stone, and I believe you. By changing, revising 1167, is it possible to change this revised statute or how do you go about the legal end of it changing it to get AORCC out of the picture, Paul?

Pete Pfeifer:

Well, you have to sponsor a bill to change the law and then the statutes are basically the interpretation of the law. Is that correct?

Paul Katz:

Again I don't want to get off the agenda, but, just as an overview the legislation is changed by people writing and proposing bills, lobbying members of the legislator or circulating petitions to get referendums, or excuse me that would be an initiative, referendums come from the legislation, then put an initiative on the ballot there are a whole bunch of different ways to change legislation. But, when you do that you also open up a can of worms to get, you might get your way. But, you are also inviting people with different special interest to seek

more oversight rather than less so it's strictly a political decision and legislative change and strictly by a member of the legislator and introducing legislative amendments to existing statutes. Which then get subjected to debate and its worst than making sausage.

John Savino:

Pete, did you have anything else?

Pete Pfeifer:

No,

John Savino:

Don, do you have any comments? Now is the time, speak or forever hold your peace.

Don French:

I'm curious about how the coalition feels about this being put in here as an OHVAG representative. I mean I know it's mandatory and we can't do anything about it. But, are you happy with this being put in here? Or how do you stand on this?

John Savino:

The Chair recognizes Jeff Gursh.

Jeff Gursh:

It's a good question; it's basically going to come down to how well AORCC works with the other two parts of the puzzle, State Parks Board and OHVAG. If you all have the same ratings, the matrix that you are working on.

John Savino:

State Park staff

Jeff Gursh:

State Park staff, it all comes down to how well the matrix works, if each person has to score for your grants and projects on the same virtues and values it shouldn't matter who is out there looking at them and you don't get extra points if the matrix doesn't say you get extra points for planting a thousand trees. It won't make a difference if a conservation asks to do. If everybody works on the same sheet and has the same things that they have to write, I don't think that you are going to have a problem.

Don French:

If that's the way that it works then I totally agree with you but, the last meeting that we had, I don't believe you were here.

Jeff Gursh:

No, I was not.

Don French:

We went by this rating grant that they wanted, in fact it went so far that Bob filled it out for us and told us how to put the numbers in it. So, we come up with these scores and then they ask us how we felt about them and two of the ones that we approved which fit into the guidelines of this rating sheet he or somebody I don't know, maybe you can tell us who denied them and then the one that we denied he pushed through. So, how is any form that we come up with here going to and then we have another group that doesn't... I mean I'm not AORCC, and I think it's a fine organization for what they do, but, I don't see how you as an Off Road advocate member of the Off Highway Coalition would want this group in here overseeing or a third or..

Jeff Gursh:

It's not a matter of wanting them here..

David Moore:

It's the law.

Jeff Gursh:

It's what we have to work with, is it something that we would like to see changed? Yes.

Don French:

Okay, that's very good.

John Savino:

Don, anything else? David?

David Moore:

Nah, it sounds like we're locked into this.

John Savino:

If we want to change this we have to go through this process.

David Moore:

Right.

John Savino:

Thank you Paul very much for that.

Paul Katz:

And just so you know my sense on that as I said earlier before I think we went on the record they were inclined at that meeting that I also attended, at Parks Board request, they were very inclined to give a strong deference to the recommendations of this group and ultimately.

Don French:

That would be new, that would be something different.

Paul Katz:



That's not going to say that they are always going to agree with you and the Park, and obviously you have to deal with the politics of the Parks Board.

John Savino:

The only comment that I have on this is that I wish that if whatever our recommendations are that it goes forward and that we be allowed not just the three minutes at the call to the public. But, we are allowed to express our reasons why we voted a certain way on a grant and so one of us a representative from the Off Highway the advisory group is allowed to go to that AORCC meeting, and sit in on that meeting and give that presentation.

Pete Pfeifer:

Just another suggestion we always have a meeting with ASCOT, we should have a joint meeting with AORCC so that we understand these people and they understand us and OHVAG would have never existed if AORCC could have done the job in the first place.

Doris Pulsifer:

If I can say something, in fact AORCC in their meeting kind of alluded to that that would be a good suggestion to hear what OHVAG suggestions were so they were actually suggesting having a joint meeting.

Group:

That's good!

Doris Pulsifer:

So, I mean it's just like Paul said, they were very supportive of OHVAG.

Don French:

The trouble is that we have trouble getting people to come to a meeting every three months.

John Savino:

That's another thing that I would like to address once we get down to it.

Paul Katz:

One thing is that I think that Parks probably could do is to make sure that even though it's put on the web site that you get notice of an AORCC meeting and when there was a public session there was nobody here at this last meeting. But, their having the same problems that you are, we had what four members?

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah, and we just barely had a quorum to.

John Savino:

The Chair recognizes Jeff Gursh.

Jeff Gursh:

Something that because it's so hard to get people together, what if you had, let's say you make a recommendation and it goes to AORCC and then they recommend, the same thing they rubber stamp it and then Parks Board does it

then you would never have to review something like that. Anything that you couldn't get like an agreement on those are the things that you sat down and came back together on and reviewed.

John Savino:

That's the way that they were supposed to be set up with where are agreement with the staff and they, before AORCC was involved, staff and us if there was a disagreement, now just because we have a disagreement what I want to do is hear staff side of it because there may be another side to it something that I'm missing and that's where I get it. Okay, I'm looking at it from the OHV community side. I want to have staffs input and I want to, you know AORCC fine. We all need to sit together and they have to hear my side of it to.

Paul Katz:

Mr. Chairman, just one comment if I might and that is I would just recommend to Parks that we make sure to get ultimately the one recommendation from you folks, staff, and AORCC out well in advancement of the Parks Board meeting and so that if we need to call a special joint meeting of AORCC and OHVAG then have staff present and the public input we can do that before it goes to the Board. So that they have a full slate before them rather than, okay we've seen this three days ago and I don't know how, if...

John Savino:

Hopefully the days are gone that we've experienced in the past was a rush to judgment in a sense that we needed to get, we were two weeks prior to and we've had our decision two weeks prior to the State Parks Board meeting because we gotta have that decision so we can present it. What's the difference why can't we present it at next month's meeting? It gives us time so if everything's fine then and we all agree then why can't we go forward with that grant and if there's any indecision on this thing then, between the three parties then we postpone that grant being presented to the Board until the following month and then discuss it.

Don French:

I believe that we had this discussion with Mr. Martyn.

John Savino:

Yeah, we did and it should all be worked out.

Paul Katz:

I just think that we need to get a process in place and see how it works and hopefully it works in a cooperative and fair way.

John Savino:

Alright, any other questions or any other comments on the AORCC?

David Moore:

I have a comment, our biggest complaint has been being essentially blindsided, where we discuss something and then something completely different happens. So, I too agree that we really need to work that way so know the opinions of all three parties prior to having it presented to the Board.

John Savino:

Right, I agree.

Pete Pfeifer:

One comment, and I just wanted to extend a thank you to Mr. Katz, Mr. Martyn on the following through and educating us on how this whole thing came about.

John Savino:

We don't like what you came up.

David Moore:

We gotta know the rules

Paul Katz:

I never had client's rather private practice or other practices that liked the advice I gave them.

Group:

(Laughter)

John Savino:

Bad news is never good news. Well thank you very much

Paul Katz:

You're welcome and if there's a legal issue then you can't go into executive session unless we have a quorum and be of help to any members of this group if it relates to your duties as OHVAG members I am not difficult to get in touch with.

Group:

Thank you.

### **3. Chairman's Report:**

John Savino:

I would like to go onto Chairman's report schedule, I can't think of anything that I would like to talk about, other than what we just discussed so I'm going on to agenda item E.

### **E. OHVAG ACTION ITEMS**

- 1. Approval of minutes from the June 1, 2012 meeting. MOTION** by Member Pfeifer, **SECOND** Member French to approve the minutes of the OHVAG June 1, 2012 minutes. **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**
- 2. OHVAG Will Discuss and Recommend Changes to the OHV Project Evaluation Form.** – Staff developed a project evaluation form that provides a quantitative analysis of projects based on the priorities for project selection identified in the off-highway vehicle statute A.R.S. §27-1176(E-H) and the State Trails Plan. The evaluation form was used to rate grant projects in the last funding cycle. OHVAG used the form and now may suggest additions, deletions or changes to the form. The discussion may include

recommendations on project application requirements and considerations for funding future projects, such as a maximum project award and proof of user community support. The Group will make a recommendation to staff as to how the revised criteria should be used to determine priority in awarding grant funds.

John Savino:

Let's go into that, Doris you have something that you would like to present to use?

Doris Pulsifer:

Sure, in the idea of the Board from their motion is that they want three recommendations going forward to them and then they'll have the ultimate say so. So, I've been working on drafting a Board report which pretty much summarizes AORCC and we're still working on staff. But let me pass around what AORCC's looks like so far.

John Savino:

Is this a different form than what we've had?

Doris Pulsifer:

No, it's the same thing, same form, you'll see it.

John Savino:

Same form but, different?

Paul Katz:

Same form, the bonuses are different.

Doris Pulsifer:

Same form but, different? I'll let you take a look at it and I'll guide you through it. What they basically did was they took the first part of the first, second, and third components and they felt that it would simplify it to make those points add up to 100 so that the base points all add up to a 100 and then in order to address the statutory requirement. Well the first statutory requirement is that preference should be given to projects that have a large number of components. So, they felt that they really, that we didn't need in the original matrix in the bonus category if you remember there was bonus points for like a 50% or more was in a certain level they got extra points and they felt that, that wasn't necessary they that just by a project having, being able to score in different areas is already saying well they have a large number of.. You know the more components that they have the higher the score so that's pretty much complying to the requirement that project should be given preference to, you know they have a lot of components. The more components the higher the score in the base category. Do you understand what I'm saying? Does that make sense? Okay..

John Savino:

Not really.

Doris Pulsifer:

Okay, let me back up, ok, first, second, and third components add up to a 100, so if you have a project that, the more components, the more components that the project is able to score in the closer you can get to 100. Okay, so that....

John Savino:

Let me ask you something really quick. Why are we so set on 100?

Doris Pulsifer:

I'm trying to explain why AORCC, they felt that to make it simpler, take the base points and make it, and make the base points 100. And then in order to address the statutory requirement, the more components that you have the more points you're going to get and that meets that requirement. That takes away from making it more complex in the bonus category. The other requirement is that preference should be given to projects that have mitigation efforts. So, they said instead of messing around in the bonus points, within 100 points go to that first level C and just give that mitigation and make it higher points because it's, that would be giving it preference to mitigation. So, it meets that requirement so, they thought that it would just simplify it, make it easier.

Paul Katz:

If I might interject, one of the things that they wanted do was they wanted the public to see those scores, we have 52 I think was the base before, something in the 50s and then bonuses and everybody had scores of like 65, 69, and the public saying why are you, might say why are you giving a grant somebody that only score 69%? People think in terms of a 100% being perfect and then bonus points would be like the A+ student that I never was.

David Moore:

That's the reason I suspect we can't answer your question, that's the way that we are taught to think, is that..

John Savino:

On their thing why do they have, I see that they felt, feel that mitigate and restore access to areas through that's more important to them then establishing and designating trails.

Doris Pulsifer:

Well, because statutorily it says preference will be given to projects that have mitigation efforts and so their trying to meet that requirement of the law..

John Savino:

But isn't there.. Go ahead Pete.

Pete Pfeifer:

Here's my comment, is there's party 1,2, and 3. Okay, and then preference has to be given to priority one, tier 1 things and tier 2. Does this look balanced to you? And it's only the numbers that we need to focus on.

John Savino:

Right, well first of all we do have an issue with the.. Okay. Are we done with the AORCC?

Doris Pulsifer:

No, no, no.. Let me continue...

John Savino:

David has a question for you..

David Moore:

Okay, my problem with both our original one and this is not with the top number but I don't see it. In the past we've been told that we had to decide if it met this criteria, we had to give it that score in the case of mitigation, you can say mitigation to put up a gate, at the entrance and block everybody out versus someone that's maintaining a trail and putting in lots and lots of work so we can use the trail. And they would both get the same 16 score and I don't think of that and I think that's exactly right. It should be 0 to 16 because there's a huge difference in mitigation of what one can be from another.

Don French:

This is their form and..

John Savino:

Let's back up you said that this is their form, we established...

Doris Pulsifer:

This is their recommendation..

John Savino:

This is our form and our rating system is supposed to be exactly what theirs is, and not have three different rating systems. So another words we're setting the scale here and how it's supposed to be and then they follow it not just have their own thing. So what we have here, so they don't have their own form as far as I'm concerned all I do is, I look at this and I say this was their suggestions to us now come up with the form accordingly.

Paul Katz:

The only, if I might Mr. Chairman. The only concern that we have to look at is §41-2702 which is solicitation and award of grant application. It says the evaluator should and this is for any grant from anywhere. It says the evaluator should review each application based solely on the evaluation criteria or factors set forth in the grant application, which is what we're doing. The evaluator shall maintain a written record of the assessment of each application and which include comments and regarding compliance with each evaluation criteria or factored the citation of a certain criteria or factors as the basis of each stated strength or weakness and clear differentiation between comment based upon facts and presented in the application and comments based on professional judgment and evaluators assessment shall be made available for public inspection no later than 30 days after the formal award is made. And I won't go into it, the only thing that they

commented on was one of the members of AORCC should we have it like 1 to 12, or 0 to 12 and the only thing is that that's a possibility and that's up to you ultimately it will be up to Parks Board. But, if we do that then you are going to need to be able to each of you as to why this is a 5 rather than an 8 and you can't just be like I like this or I feel this. What I'm saying is straight by a number, you don't have to have notes it either does or doesn't meet the criteria if it halfway meets the criteria then one last comment to is that if somebody just comes in with a project that does mitigation and restoration then they might get 16 points, but if they're not constructing new trails or OHVAG education then, or signage or law enforcement that promotes those activities then or off-highway vehicle use they will end up with a 16 out of 100 for their score. So I don't necessarily think that that's a threat but you can do it anyway you want. I'm just advising you up front that if you start doing it within a range then you're going to have to take detailed notes and you're going to have to distinguish. Say you have 30 grant proposals and you're going to have to distinguish each one on each criteria.

John Savino:

I'm sorry I cut off Don.

Paul Katz:

And I'm sorry that I interrupted.

Don French:

Well I understand that you want to give mitigation and possibly some preference but I mean what they're doing here is, it's obvious what they want total commitment to the mitigation but not new trails or anything else.

Doris Pulsifer:

But that's because it's a statutory requirement.

Don French:

But four points higher than the other, I mean...

John Savino:

It's not a statute, there are other statutes, and they didn't single out mitigation here separate from the rest.

Doris Pulsifer:

Yes, they did

John Savino:

No, they just said this is the top priorities.

David Moore:

Right, here's a pyramid.

Doris Pulsifer:

The statute says preference should be given to projects with mitigation efforts...

John Savino:

And, and, and, and...

Doris Pulsifer:

No,

John Savino:

They didn't just stop there. Can you please get that and while we're doing that Jeff, do you..

Jeff Gursh:

Flew right out my hat, sorry. I was thinking about something else.

John Savino:

You made a note and..

Jeff Gursh:

As far as the scores in rating them we would have to know as the grant writer that we had to elaborate on whether or not mitigation was, let's say that I had five-thousand dollars worth of trail repairs as mitigation as my project. You wouldn't know what the mitigation is though on those trail repairs. So, I would actually have to know that I had to elaborate to tell you that I was putting in a boundary fence and parking lot and we have all the area behind closed to the fence line now. You'd need to know that and then us as grant writers would need to know that we would need to include that information. So whatever comes out of here hopefully will trickle down to the folks that's writing them so you have the information.

John Savino:

That's the whole thing Jeff is the reason that I've asked you to sit here is that you've more grants than probably anybody known to mankind and I want to get that input as to what, in order for this to work then we have to let the grant writer know to put down on there. And we also at the same time the Off-Highway Advisory Group members have to do the research to call to do the research on that because one thing that we run into is and afraid of is the last time with the Game and Fish grant that they put up, they wanted to do a survey they marked yes on every category, okay, **everything**, yes across the board. Well that didn't make sense, so it behooves us to go out and be afforded the time to go out and do that research towards the grant. We get back to the thing where it goes back to this rating system goes and does for the research that we have to do to give it, to give it a benefit of the doubt that project. Does AORCC have that kind of time to go out and are they going to go out and do the research? No, so right there they're looking at a different aspect. But, we do have to get that down there.

Pete Pfeifer:

There was a project that was proposed to us. Right? They wanted funding for it and it was to develop questions for a future holding or whatever and they've got all these marks. Right.

John Savino:

That's what I'm saying, that was the whole thing so it would work. Okay, Doris.



Doris Pulsifer:

Okay, back to your question, I've got the statute here, and the statute says 281176 section E and then it starts with E2 and it says, to establish an off-highway vehicle program based on the priorities established in the off-highway vehicle plan and then goes on and it talks about designate, construct, renovate, repair, it goes into all these different things. Then you go to that same statute and you go to H and it reads the "Arizona State Parks Board shall examine applications for eligible projects and determine the amount of funding if any for each project. In determining the amount of monies for eligible projects the Arizona State Parks Board shall give preference to applications with projects with mitigation efforts and for projects that encompass a large number of purposes described in subsection E", which is what I just read, paragraphs 3 thru 7 of this section.

John Savino:

So it's not just saying mitigation, it's saying if it is encumbering all those, you know all these things and given priority. But I want to get back to the thing that State Parks Board when their supposed to be, if I was on the Parks Board that's what my decision is going to be based on. That's not our decision.

Doris Pulsifer:

But, don't you want, you're going to forward your recommendation to the Parks Board, knowing that the Parks Board has to comply to this then you need to make a recommendation.

John Savino:

I guess what I'm saying is, I, Just as much as mitigation on that thing, I look at something that's not mentioned in the 1167 is spreading the wealth around the state and doing that and looking at the big picture. Looking at the picture and stuff, that's not in there at all, and I weigh that just as much as I do mitigation

Doris Pulsifer:

Okay, that's when you go into your, you start addressing those types of things in your bonus categories.

David Moore:

Right, I want to speak about the bonus categories. Looking at what they've done and what we've done in the past. If what the Attorney General is saying is that we need to if we're going to defend each and every decision if there's a floating scale. Then maybe the easy way is to have a bonus category that just says, that's strictly for the groups thing without any criteria that the amount, that the group gives it credit or that we can write a definition on one item. So if a grant comes then we can say we give and have this one be ten points or something or if this is five so we can say that the group feels that this is a particularly important project because this, and it has these benefits and we can make a statement on one little part for those points and add it up if we are going to score just fill in boxes on the rest. We need some way to make our group have, to bother to have us get here and discuss everything and to come up with something together rather than just check, check, check, check. We don't need to be a group to that.

Doris Pulsifer:

Let me say this and you know you're kind of getting into when you're actually going to rate grants and looking at what, why you think a project is good or isn't good. You know besides a project being eligible there's the question of whether it's a good use of the money. And this is where you get into that end of your matrix, the very, very end where it says justification because at the end of the day after you have rated your grant your going to find maybe you have one that rates 98 points and you've got one that rates 58 points. And maybe, maybe the one that rated 58 points maybe for whatever reason didn't rate quite well but maybe there's something about that project that makes it valuable and good and you feel well we feel that it's a worthy project and we feel that even though it rated 58 we would like to recommend it. You need to justify that or the other way around.

John Savino:

But this is kind of a dig is that sort of like what we did on the last one, the racing thing up in Snowflake or the Lake Havasu one we voted and they rated low 27 points. But we recommended that they get funded. Sort of like that and they weren't funded....

Doris Pulsifer:

Part of the reasons that three recommendations are going to go forward to the Board. The Board is going to look at all three of them and this is part of their rationale is to having three recommendations. They are going to want to know what your justification is, what is AORCC's justification, and what's staff's recommendation and they're going to look and weigh all three of them and if you can make your case they may go with your recommendation it depends on how you make your case.

John Savino:

Pete?

Pete Pfeifer:

We're kind of going all over the place on this form. One question that I have this is just to you guys. When you look at this for a second, first, second, and third tier, okay, do want this points to be more flat or are you happy with this curve right here?

John Savino:

No, I want to have, no, I agree, I just, I want to hear from everybody on our board. I would like to have it to where it says a scale like a 0 to, if you have it to where the one on the top is like 12.

Pete Pfeifer:

Yeah, I don't think that you can do a 0 to 12 just because simply then we would have to write documentation for it. But my question is do you think a level 1 is three times greater or should have three times the points than a level 3 has? Or should it be a little bit more flat? We can always juggle the points for that.

David Moore:

Two comments, that's one way to do that to bring the amounts closer together the other thing is you've automatically taken section C in level 1 and made it not level 1 anymore, it's a super level 1, so these either have to be, you're either going to have to put mitigation in its own thing, if it's going to be the number one priority it's going to have to be the same as the others.

Pete Pfeifer:

We can make it one point greater or simply so that it meets the statute.

Paul Katz:

You can leave it one point greater, instead of four or you can take four off, leave it level and add one point to each of the four categories and either second level or third level so you are still tallying up to a hundred.

Pete Pfeifer:

My concern is simply keeping a balance within the OHV program so that's it's not all just mitigation, and it's not all just education.

David Moore:

No, I agree.

John Savino:

The Chair recognizes Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

On the tier three under D for dust mitigation, rather than C being so high for the types of mitigation that you show here, could you roll the dust mitigation into there and that would be your extra four points. Where it would be flat at 12 unless it was dust mitigation you could get some bonus points in there for that. We're getting more and more to the point that in Maricopa County, Yavapai County, and now all of Pinal County that if you don't do some kind of dust treatment then there's no OHV use.

John Savino:

So you're saying take that and that should be part of the mitigating efforts?

Jeff Gursh:

Well because it's a tiered, yeah, if you roll that one in it would get you the extra four points and just add the dust mitigation and tag under C. Could you put a tier one and a tier three?

Paul Katz:

I think that legally you could do that or you can maybe take C and level 1 and maybe make it 14 points and then go dust to 2 or you could maybe even take it down and add things to a different level. What do you think Doris?

Doris Pulsifer:

I'm a little bit confused on this.

Jeff Gursh:

You've got mitigation, basically you are saying mitigation twice, if C stayed at 12 but you could add four additional points in for dust mitigation.

Doris Pulsifer:

So make dust 8 and make...

Jeff Gursh:

Maybe it just makes it to complicated.

John Savino:

Let me, I'm going to address Don. Chair addresses Don.

Don French:

Well I don't understand, I mean, apparently mitigation, and I don't agree with the way you read that thing that it's got to be a priority, mitigation's a priority it says mitigation and the other groups are all one. And I am going down on the record as saying I don't think mitigation should be any higher than establishing, maintaining, renovating existing trails and routes that's part of mitigation on B. I mean...

John Savino:

It says basically the same thing, isn't it? If you are maintaining trails aren't you doing the same thing as mitigating?

Jeff Gursh:

Originally when we were working on this part of the 1167, the conservation folks wanted to see more things being fixed that were damaged by OHV use, again illegal parking area, and illegal trails, being closed and rehabbed. What we agreed to was then if you have a project, say I'm building a new trail and I have a mitigation component tied to it, that would get preference over, over having, I'm just doing a trail. Same would apply if I have a mitigation project, it would score lower by itself, if it wasn't tied to having it part of an OHV project. So if I had a new staging area and all I was going to do was put up a fence then that didn't have any mitigation, it would score lower than if we had a project with mitigation included. That's how we originally envisioned it.

Paul Katz:

That's what I think you could do, I'm not telling you that you can put any value that you want in there, but you could bring it down to 12 and then reassign let's say in the third level make them all 5, instead of fours and you could make dust mitigation another..

Doris Pulsifer:

Eight

Paul Katz:

Four or eight, so we just have to have in the big picture some priority given to projects that get mitigation. But, if they get mitigation then if one project has no mitigation in it then they're not going to get 12 or 14 or 16 points. What I'm saying is just because they went that way based upon, AORCC did, their reading or interpretation of the statute you could bring that down to the same level. But I still

would recommend we add extra points to the some of the other categories so that we still end up under that 100 matrix.

John Savino:

Chair recognizes Don.

Don French:

I'm trying to understand the difference why you want to give mitigate, restore damage areas surrounding trails, routes, and areas, a higher priority than you would maintaining and renovate existing trails and routes, it's doing the same thing.

Jeff Gursh:

And in this case if they would make them all flat then add the extra points to the..

David Moore:

1 point

Paul Katz:

For the dust mitigation, and 1 point each for number three

David Moore:

That makes sense

Paul Katz:

It's just a suggestion that I made and I don't know what all will come out of the wash.

John Savino:

Our recommendation, from what I'm hearing is to make them all flat at what level 12?

Group:

12

David Moore:

And then on the third level raise those all to 5

John Savino:

Okay, so put 12 on the first level, the second level would stay at 8.

David Moore:

Yes

John Savino:

The third level would be at 5.

David Moore:

Yes

John Savino:

Pete, what do you think about that?

Pete Pfeifer:

It brings about some evening of the...

John Savino:

Okay, now what I would like to do. I see an agreement on that for right now. I feel on the second level priority, (A) increase on the ground management presence and law enforcement that should be a third level and the reason why, I looked at and I read that, the 1167, and yes it says law enforcement on it. I'm looking at the bigger picture, when, as I mentioned, I think it was off the record earlier and I'll mention it now. When Game and Fish, which is our law enforcement agency when they get over two thirds of our entire OHV money recreation fund. When they get over two thirds of that money, then their taking care of the education part and that. Now for us to consider that and yes we need to consider that, but it should be a third level priority as far as points given because we're already giving out. What I'm looking at is that part there two years ago we gave out money to the Coconino Sheriff's Department. That's kind of where that comes in but, it shouldn't be a second level priority. We're also giving; let me finish one thing, Doris. We're also giving a good chunk of our money, well more than we should in my own mind to the Ambassador Program. The Ambassador Program has an aspect that's supporting law enforcement and education. So, we're giving over half our money in a sense to the Ambassador Program and we're giving over two thirds of the entire OHV funding recreation fund in the state to law enforcement. I don't feel in our own looking at this thing that for our projects money, that shouldn't be that high. Pete.

Pete Pfeifer:

I'm totally in agreement with you except I don't think we can move it as far as its level we can only change the points that we associate with it and then if we lower those points in it and that area we're going to have to make sure to everybody let them know why.

John Savino:

I want to ask something, but first, Doris, you had something.

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah, keep in mind that law enforcement/increase on the ground management present law enforcement, that's a second level priority in the plan and the statute says, the statute refers to the plan.

John Savino:

Okay, but I want to go back to the.. Let me ask Jeff something real quick. Jeff, in the intent of SB1167 when you wrote the sticker fund, when you were writing it, what was the intent along the emphasis on law enforcement for state parks, not for the whole plan because we already know that Game and Fish already gets their money for that. The intent when it was written it addresses law enforcement and education as far as Game and Fish goes. Let's talk about the State Parks end of that obligation.

Jeff Gursh:

Well I'm not sure if you would say State Parks, folks apply for the grant so it would be Federal lands and State lands...

John Savino:

Yes, but the money comes from projects money, from the State Parks.

Jeff Gursh:

So for the grant money outside the 35% that the Game and Fish gets for law enforcement we envisioned it going for, funds for a Park Ranger like a BLM, LEO, or Forest Protection Officer on the forest, for signs, education that's where we were looking for additional funding out of the grant program that didn't come from Game and Fish. We honestly hadn't envisioned hiring law enforcement from the outside grant money from Game and Fish other than to supplement that agency like a sweep weekend, or twice a year they do some kind of project with Game and Fish, Park Rangers do some kind of sweeps in those areas. We honestly never looked at funding law enforcement separately out of the State Parks grant money.

John Savino:

When you say that you also say, that includes the equipment, when you say funding law enforcement equipment that was the intent.

David Moore:

I wanted to make that statement see this gives every law enforcement agency an automatic thing cause if they apply they say, there's a law enforcement component and we get those 8 points no matter what. You know and that's if they want to buy a razor or if they want to buy any other equipment or any of those kinds of things. And so it's like an unfair advantage compared to anybody else that's making a grant application.

John Savino:

Okay, Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

And I'm thinking the way that this would work would be that if that law enforcement agency had just a category and 8 points and it couldn't apply to any of the other categories, they would have next to no points. Even though he had some extra weight to his getting money, it would still score very low. Because, you wouldn't have had anything to do with the other stuff.

John Savino:

Jeff, I'm getting back to that thing that, let me refer back to it because we have one time and I'm referring back to the Game and Fish thing. Game and Fish they put in a thing for a survey out there well they checked their thing that they have law enforcement thing. Well they're a law enforcement agency so they put it down, they get points for that and we have to get away from that.

Paul Katz:

They didn't get the grant though.

Doris Pulsifer:

And that's what we're trying to say.

John Savino:

Well then let's go back to that then, because you refer back to that they didn't get the grant and so it's a mute point then. The two that we passed, you guys denied. Why?

Paul Katz:

You'll have to ask the Parks Board, I don't know.

John Savino:

Why did you deny the Snowflake one? And why did you deny the standard wash one, Havasu? When we passed them. So if you're going to open this up we gotta go both ways here, and I'm not trying to be confrontational.

Doris Pulsifer:

I know, and I'm trying to remember those the..

John Savino:

Snowflake one..

Doris Pulsifer:

The Snowflake one there was, I guess Bob had a letter from them, Forest Service or...

John Savino:

And that letter and I read it and it was pro and they said that they were going to use it. He read it, he misinterpreted it.

Doris Pulsifer:

It wasn't open to the trails that were going to...

John Savino:

Neither was three years ago when we came to that or four years ago when we funded a mud crawling place down in Tucson, and that wasn't open. So, don't, let's not go there, I'm trying to not be confrontational.

Doris Pulsifer:

That had to do with the roads were, the projects were going to benefit an event versus being open to the public.

David Moore:

Come to think of it, I read that letter in response and it was an extremely narrow view and like the promoter was making all this gain. You know, and I don't know if any of you have been to that event. But, it is absolutely the largest event in any of the National Forrest that happened in Arizona, and there are ten-thousand people, if it wasn't one person, it was ten-thousand people that were affected by this decision.



Doris Pulsifer:

And we're getting off of the...

David Moore:

All because one promoter promotes the event..

John Savino:

You opened it up when you said that we're going to deny this because..

David Moore:

He straight out said in the letter, I am denying this because one man is going to benefit, you know, Jay, and that's not he's just. Jay is putting together a program that ten-thousand people benefit from.

Don French:

We're not arguing..

Paul Katz:

But the main thing is that ultimately I would hope when they get input, particularly from this group that the Parks Board is going to do the right thing. But they're not necessarily gonna do what you want them to do unless, and that's why I think we need to get things moving so that everybody gets the materials in front of them early on. So that the applicants and the public and any special interest groups can make comments to the Parks Board officially well in advance and even at their meetings so it just doesn't say that we're going to accept or reject that.

John Savino:

And I hope in the future we can move forward along those, it's just you know... Go ahead Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

Something I was thinking about last night, when I'm looking at grants, I was thinking what would it be like to be you guys is I'm assuming that staff has already looked at everything that has come to them and that has been approved for all of the pieces so maybe a category here that says it's all been approved, all of the things you need from

Doris Pulsifer:

It wouldn't even get this far if it hadn't

Jeff Gursh:

Right, so for you guys just having it checked off on the box would have been, it sounds like from Bob's perspective that it didn't honestly meet the grant criteria to have come to him or he wouldn't have

John Savino:

He's turned down, no, because he has turned back grants that didn't meet all the criteria on that before or he's called the person. He called me, I was involved in that grant, okay, first of all I think that whole grant process has a lot, leaves a lot to be desired, it is so confusing. One of the reasons that I.. I was asked by the Forest Service to write that grant. Okay, one of the reasons that I took that on was is I

wanted to see that end of it process. To see where, I 'm at the other end of it and I wanted to see that end of it and it was so confusing, it is just beyond, I mean you have to really do a lot of work on that and they took the fun away from it. So, Jeff you can go ahead. Do you have anything?

Jeff Gursh:

My other point was, what I've done in the past is actually come to Bob, because they are such a headache and to try to figure out. So if you actually go back to Bob and he helps you score them. I'm in the same boat where I missed something completely and didn't even know I was supposed to have it.

John Savino:

He was supposed to do that. So let's go on to, we got off the subject, but I had to get that out there and we still haven't resolved that, we will someday down the road, hopefully. So are guys satisfied with this number system? 12, 8, & 5, Okay.

David Moore:

Yes.

John Savino:

Okay, we are on the subject of what I had brought up, increase the ground, on the ground management presence, and law enforcement. Should that be there? Can we move it to somewhere else?

David Moore:

I think in the original thing it is a second level.

Paul Katz:

We can't move them but we can change the numbers associated with them.

John Savino:

Well if you change that number then..

Paul Katz:

They don't all have to be the same..

John Savino:

They don't have to be the same? So then... Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

I apologize, when we write a bill we can put in a letter of legislative intent, basically saying this is what we mean by this law. Could you actually put a definition under (A) that explained what you could get for law enforcement under that category. If you are letting Game and Fish actually do the policeman's part of it could this.. You specify what you would allow under the law enforcement part of it. Would that be possible under the definitions?

Doris Pulsifer:

Define it?

Jeff Gursh:

That way you would know what it will go for and you aren't going to have some guy come and say I want two new squad cars.

David Moore:

Right.

Pete Pfeifer:

That could go for all of those types, people were confused when they filled out this form. Bob was the one telling us, well this is what that really means, here's what that really means.

Jeff Gursh:

Every one of these need, actually needs these definitions so that there are no one to argue with you down the road and I as the writer would know what I'm supposed to be able to do and you would know what I'm supposed to be able to get.

John Savino:

Right, it has to be fair.

Doris Pulsifer:

If you go into your, the criteria that you got, I think it says... I don't remember what it says, but if you look in..

Pete Pfeifer:

Let me give you some examples, if farmer John says yada, yada, yada...

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah, but then, but as far as what the issue is as far as the state trail plan then it explains it, I mean it's quoted right out of the state trails plan, let me see here... If you can find the one that says...

David Moore:

What page number Doris?

John Savino:

While we're doing this the floor addresses Don French who wants to speak.

Don French:

I just wanted to... We need to keep this thing simple, I've been arguing that since the beginning. It's going to take somebody like Jeff to study and know how to do this and to fill out a grant and I think.. I would like to keep it to where anybody can fill it out you know and where it gets down to where you have to hire a professional grant writer to get a grant then.. We want to get the money out there, that was Director Martyn's thing you know, I want the money to get out to the people and by complicating these forms and.. I think we should keep that in mind every time we..

John Savino:

Let's go one step further on this and fix that and we looked at taking this before, you know Jeff can concur to this and with the RTP money, there was a form that was two inches thick that you had to fill out and then we did it once a year when

the intent was, when we did the sticker fund SB1167 on our end of it was to streamline this to get this as simple as possible so we can get the money out and vote on it every quarter and get it out there on the ground. We're going so gosh darn long.. We spent a year on this form alone, and this is getting way out of hand so how do we... And keeping in mind, we have to meet what the state, what our obligation is as our rules are. How do we make this simple? Pete.

Pete Pfeifer:

When this originally came up, okay, Dave suggested something to make it easier for us..

David Moore:

Strictly for us

Pete Pfeifer:

It quickly evolved in 501(3)(C) to justify your opinions on this project to this level of detail. But, the comment was made to Bob that we're practically becoming grant evaluators and he said that's correct and you know he said that and I went "oh my goodness" when he said that. The grant process is confusing enough the columns are confusing enough the interpretations are confusing and keep going over the same ground over and over again. I think today what we have to do is basically come up with the numbers associated with these. And then we'll have to on the back end, understand exactly what these titles refer to so we can properly evaluate the grant to say well this is something about law enforcement and what that actually falls under.

Doris Pulsifer:

And if you look at this other form, if you go to page 38 in..

John Savino:

Our old..

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah, it explains what the State Trails plan, how it defined or why the increase. I guess you could say it is the justification The State Trails plan for that particular piece the second level priority component (A) which increased on the ground management presence law enforcement. Then you go to page 38 and this is right out of the State Trails plan, so this is I guess kind of the definition, the justification as to why this is a second level priority. So when you're looking to define how you're going to assign points you need to consider what is in the State Trail Plan so need to come back and look at page 38, and what does page 38 say, what do you need to look for?

Pete Pfeifer:

This thing here is the whole "Rosetta Stone" for figuring out this thing.

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah.

Pete Pfeifer:

Well we have to figure out the whole point value thing.

John Savino:

Well, we did. Didn't we? 12, 8, & 5.

Paul Katz:

Well we need to vote on it ultimately.

John Savino:

Okay, Don. The chair recognizes Don.

Don French:

Let's say that we decided to take these point numbers like this, I'm going to throw something out there. I keep hearing that these bonus categories is going to help us, but, why do we need bonus categories...

Group:

You don't...

Don French:

Just throwing it out there..

John Savino:

That's our next thing that we're going to address..

Don French:

And it has to do with these points and I don't know.. It may..

Doris Pulsifer:

You don't have to have them.

Don French:

So I'm going to leave it open for discussion, say okay here's the points we've got it from 100 to... 0 to 100 I assume

David Moore:

Make it add up to 100 but incorporate the bonus categories into the others..

Don French:

Now we sit here and have a discussion and have to justify, if we want a low one and don't want a high one there's going to have to be.. But I don't know why need..

Paul Katz:

Well you could have bonus, you could have no bonus points or you could have bonus points completely different than the ones that are here. They don't all have to be 5.

Pete Pfeifer:

That's what Joy said they could be for somebody with brown hair and blue eyes..

Paul Katz:

They could be for a rural county

Don French:

We need to tie our hands to do that

Paul Katz:

Well and that's where I said can we give extra bonus points for club affiliations and they told us no. We said that would be a way to promote clubs and organizations.

John Savino:

That's still bonus points and Kent does that really affect how we vote, if we vote on 12, 8, & 5?

John Savino:

It doesn't on that part

Pete Pfeifer:

That's the second section

John Savino:

We're going to vote on this and we'll go to the bonus, we may not even have a bonus. Okay? So, I would like to entertain a motion to approve going first level component priority have all of A, B, C, & D 12 points, second level component priority bonus A, B, C, & D at 8 points, and third level priority A, B, C, & D at 5 points. Do I have a motion? Just say you ditto what I said.

Pete Pfeifer:

Alright, I would like to make a motion to ditto what John said.

Doris Pulsifer:

Okay, and that's fine, before you make a second, just one thing because I need to write this recommendation for the Board, when I present it to the Board, I want to be able to write and I want to make sure I'm clear, and that I got it right, what the justification is, why, because they're going to want to know why did you go with that. Is your, and tell me if I'm wrong, so the justification would be because you feel that Game and Fish already gets...

John Savino:

No, no Doris. We are leaving that where it is.

Doris Pulsifer:

Okay

John Savino:

We're not touching the.. We're just talking about making all the first level priorities same amount, second level 8, and third level 5. Just flat out. The reasons why are because we feel that first level priorities is higher than second level priority, and second level priority is higher than the third level.

Paul Katz:

You're also feeling that all of the four first level priorities..

John Savino:

Are equal

Paul Katz:

Are equal.

Don French:

Yes

Paul Katz:

So if you have one and not the others

John Savino:

So do I have a second on this motion?

Don French:

I second

John Savino:

Don French seconds it. Discussion? We just had a discussion. Anymore? Okay, all those in favor say aye.

Group:

Aye

John Savino:

The four of us voted yes on this

Doris Pulsifer:

I'm sorry. Who was second?

John Savino:

Don French.

Doris Pulsifer:

Don, okay

John Savino:

Okay, we're clear on that. Now what I would like to do is take a five minute break and then we'll come back and address the bonus.

John Savino:

Okay at this time I would like to bring this meeting back in order on Monday, August 27, 2012 Arizona State Parks the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group meeting at 10:47am. We are back in order right where we left off was we approved the rating system, the number rating system, on the first, second, and third level priority components. Now what we would like to go into is the bonus section of this rating sheet for the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group. So, I would like to open it up. Does anybody have... David?

David Moore:

I have a statement, on the AORCC's sheet and I think on the other one, I haven't compared them yet, but anyway, this educational programs fully responsible for safe trails group. How is that any different then section D of the second level?

John Savino:

First of all, if I understand this right, this isn't a, this isn't ours, we don't have any say so in this, that's AORCC's.

Paul Katz:

That's AORCC's and AORCC's is going to stay, you guys.

John Savino:

So we can't really address this first part because that's AORCC's

Pete Pfeifer:

We can accept them our..

Paul Katz:

You can accept them or reject them but you can just say we want to adopt the following bonus categories or we don't want them, adopt them

John Savino:

Let's go back to David's question, David could you restate it?

David Moore:

The AORCC bonus which is, they say priority number two is education programs promoting responsible and safe trail use and I referred to the second level priority in the main motorized trails plan recommendation second level priority components, section D, provide educational programs.

John Savino:

So why are they doing it twice? Doris?

Doris Pulsifer:

Okay, remember that I'm on your original matrix you had a bonus category for OHVAG priority, for on the ground, so you.. This is AORCC's way of saying this is our priority, we think that priority that education projects have extra points because we think that education is really important. So, that's AORCC's priority, if you guys think that on the ground projects or whatever it is then you can have a category or whatever it is. And let me, while you're looking at AORCC's priorities let me add that in staff, what we're coming up with, what we like AORCC's priorities, but, we went a little bit further in defining them a little bit more plus we added one extra one, on ours we added a category for projects and sustainability we thought that was important.

John Savino:

Okay, Don.



Don French:

I think we're probably asking the same question. Can we have a copy of your recommendation?

Doris Pulsifer:

Sure

John Savino:

And is that what you were going to ask, Pete?

Pete Pfeifer:

Exactly

Doris Pulsifer:

Sure

David Moore:

My next question, if you added one then are you still using the same 25 point bonus system?

Paul Katz:

You can have 35 points. 30. 27.

David Moore:

Or we can compare apples and apples in all three arms of the groups.

Paul Katz:

Because what AORCC said was we think that these things should be given extra consideration, now's the time for you to absent lady and the gentleman who are present to make the decision as to what if any additional bonus points you want to get for things that this group thinks are priorities. And ultimately the Parks Board will take some of what you have to say and some of what staff has to say.

Don French:

So we will end up with one form?

Paul Katz:

Yeah, well..

David Moore:

The only difference being the bonus points section.

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah, and you know the Parks Board may do they may, you know if we are all pretty much in agreement, pretty close on the first section there they may look at, I'm thinking they'll probably look at the priorities that AORCC has, and that you guys have and that we have and if there's any that are all the same then they'll probably keep it then if there's some that you have that AORCC doesn't have or however then they may say you we agree you know AORCC we like that one of AORCC's even though OHVAG doesn't think that is a priority. Or they'll say OHVAG didn't have one that AORCC didn't recognize but OHVAG that it was a

priority the Board may end up with 150 points, you know they may adopt all of the bonus and they may think well maybe this one isn't that important and may pull it out. So the Board may look at it a little bit differently at the end of the day.

John Savino:

All three groups, will have the first, they'll still use the point system will be 12, 8, & 5. Will be the same on all three groups?

Don French:

It's up to the Board to take these three things and decide and we're already out voted on the 16 so..

Doris Pulsifer:

How are you out voted on the 16?

John Savino:

AORCC and State Parks..

John Savino:

On the 16..

Doris Pulsifer:

And we're still working on ours we don't, it doesn't necessarily..

Paul Katz:

What they did, I think to a large extent was to take what AORCC had to say and they haven't sat down to reflect this isn't their final..

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah, it's not our final..

John Savino:

But when it's all said and done, because those people out there, the grant writers need to know what the playing field is and it has to be fair. Shouldn't this numbering system for the first three categories be the same. And across the board for AORCC, State Parks, and for us, and they will be.

Paul Katz:

They will be..

John Savino:

They will be? Okay, now that's my question, and now the differences in the bonus points. Our bonus points could be totally different then..

Doris Pulsifer:

You mean going forward to the Board?

John Savino:

Yes!

Doris Pulsifer:

No! Because AORCC's is AORCC's recommendation, you guys have a little bit different. I mean they still add up to 100.

John Savino:

I don't mean how you actually rate us with a specific grant, I mean what the categories are. There's only 12 points for each first level priority, there's only 8 for the second, and there's only 5 for the third.

Don French:

We don't know that, it's just our recommendation and that's what I'm telling you. They're going to take our recommendation, their recommendation and AORCC's recommendation..

John Savino:

We've lost right off the bat..

Paul Katz:

Doris, Doris, I don't want to speak for Doris.. My understanding is this was just a draft based upon the input that we had today, she's going to redo this whole thing and it may be totally different then what either you or AORCC..

Doris Pulsifer:

They're going to consider what you say to.

Don French:

Right, we only do what we can do..

David Moore:

Right.. What we can do is make our bonus categories ours.

Paul Katz:

Mr. Chairman if I might clarify, at AORCC they were hopefully, that, they wanted to have your recommendation before they met. But, it was impossible to do it so they're going to be independent recommendations. But staff hadn't heard from you folks yet in terms of how you want it scored so they just put together what was there and ultimately they may have said seven bonus categories or zero or three.

Pete Pfeifer:

One question that I have, in the future can we revisit this form? It's not written in stone, right?

Doris Pulsifer:

Right, exactly, probably each cycle you would want to look at this and make adjustments because maybe your priority may change, times change, situations changing, and you may see where maybe there's a greater need in a different area and you may want to come back in a different cycle and change it. It's not written in stone this isn't what it's going to be forever.

John Savino:

Don.

Don French:

I have a question, how is this going to work as far as (inaudible).. You're going to have a quorum, we're going to have a quorum recommendation and then AORCC's going to have one. How are we going to get together and see what other recommendations before this is forwarded to the Board are we going to have this opportunity or..

Doris Pulsifer:

I have to have this done in to, for their packets before the 10<sup>th</sup>, so what I can do I mean I can provide you a, when they approve, when my boss approves the final report I can send it to you to look at, what my draft is.

Don French:

How are we going to have a discussion, you know it's coming down to the same thing.

Doris Pulsifer:

Well the only thing I can tell you is, I mean you have AORCC's

Don French:

We're sitting here discussing our form with us and yet we don't have that same opportunity to discuss AORCC's form with them or your form with you. I don't see..

Paul Katz:

And AORCC didn't have the opportunity to discuss anything with anyone but that's just...

Doris Pulsifer:

I mean I can send you a draft of...

Don French:

This is a form that we're all trying to come up with together and make it a universal form and yet we're not talking to each and we don't have the opportunity to sit down and share our ideas together.

Doris Pulsifer:

This is the direction that we cause one of the things that I asked, could we have one form, mailed one form and send one form to the Board, and my direction was, no. We want three separate recommendations. So, don't kill the messenger.

John Savino:

See that's what.. Okay, you get your marching orders from your bosses. So, the first form because we have to go out to the public that's writing those grants. That first part of that form has to be identical, now whether it's rated higher, how it's rated is totally separate. But, we have to let them know that for projects to access the trails, acquire land for public access you get x amount of points they have to know that going in. From all three parties, now the bonus section is a totally different thing, that's how we feel as an OHV community that's how they feel going into these parks. So, that first part has to be agreed on and what Don is saying is, how can we agree on something if we aren't talking. So far we are not in agreement because the State Parks put down 16 points and AORCC put down 16 points.

Doris Pulsifer:

And I think the answer is because whatever it turns out to be is, it will be..

John Savino:

The same?

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah, because the Board is going to make that decision, it won't be your decision, my decision, or AORCC's decision. The only thing that I can suggest is you assign or assign a liaison, or somebody to go to the Parks Board and represent OHVAG on your behalf to say this is why we want this way and say something at the Parks Board to defend your recommendation to the Board.

Paul Katz:

And or write the members a letter.

Doris Pulsifer:

Or write a letter.

Paul Katz:

You're going to get the report from staff that incorporates it.

Doris Pulsifer:

Now keep in mind what I'm doing to justify these recommendations is if you look at the top and see I'll add from it.. See and this is why I was asking you, I need to make sure I have your intent in here, because for like AORCC recommendation it says the points combined all three levels and it goes on its to address the requirements in the State trails plan and the statute. That's why I need from you when you make your recommendation today make sure that you back it up so that I can put your backup, your reason, your justification, in that motion.

Paul Katz:

At the top of the sheet. See I didn't know that's why you were taking notes, see I didn't know that you were going to put it at the top of the sheet.

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah, they're going to ask and you guys need to know.

Pete Pfeifer:

That's how we justify, how we came up with a 12 for mitigation

Paul Katz:

That all the categories should be treated equally with the first priority

Doris Pulsifer:

That's really important

John Savino:

So we have further recording let's do according to rule and get addressed so that the tape is going to be so messed up because if we all start talking at once, so raise your hand and I'll address the person. Alright? Okay, Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

Something to add then to the comments you made for Doris, why you made your changes, you wanted to mention that you wanted to weigh the mitigation under your third tier, because that would go back towards mitigation under your first tier. So that it's still weighed higher you just split it into two different categories because you already had mitigation in tier three that way you can help justify your reasoning for changing to all 12.

David Moore:

That's exactly correct.

John Savino:

Are you okay with that?

David Moore:

Yes I am

Doris Pulsifer:

So to weigh mitigation higher through the third.

Group:

Inaudible

David Moore:

It already is weighed higher.

Paul Katz:

We feel that they should all be treated equally

David Moore:

In the third level..

John Savino:

That's why we are leaving it all at 12

Pete Pfeifer:

That's where you get your 16 points, is that you've already got it in another category.

John Savino:

Are you in agreement with that? Pete? Don?

Don French:

I'm not sure I quite understand that you're doing there.

John Savino:

He's saying because, on there they have 16 there, but we're saying 12 there make them all even because you're getting the rest of the points over here you know on this level like dust prevention for instance you make up for that 12 points over here.

Don French:

Well and I also think that there in category B on your first level priorities it's part of mitigation.

Paul Katz:

Well I think it would be sufficient to agree that we feel that OHVAG levels priority should be treated equally and also mitigation should be taken into consideration and dealt with in a third level priority component and....

John Savino:

Unless you guys want to open this up again, we voted, we seconded, and approved it that we would go with 12, 8, & 5 and that's ended unless you want to open it up again.

David Moore:

We are just justifying for the record.

John Savino:

For the record. Okay.

Paul Katz:

But what we are talking about is the explanation at the top, I don't think we need a motion. Just a clarification and have the rationale clarified.

John Savino:

Do you have what you need?

Doris Pulsifer:

Yes, perfect.

John Savino:

Let's go onto the bonus section, we looked at the AORCC priorities and now their bonuses and we're looking at State Parks and it looks like it is identical isn't it?

Doris Pulsifer:

It is other than on ours we went a little bit further in declining it because we figured out when you go to rate it we are going to have to justify why we are going to need to know what this means, how is it defined so we went a little bit further and defined it.

Pete Pfeifer:

Something that I would like each of us to do is the bonus categories I would like to get everybody's opinion on them and how they feel about them.

John Savino:

Which forms?

Pete Pfeifer:

All of them. In other words project sustainability, I think that's agreed. First time applicants is agreed, and new members, community support, that's what basically I was driving out when I said I would like to see clubs and organizations to be part

of this. Successful completion and administration of OHV projects once again would be great and all of these people are coming back a second time and being successful with another one.

Doris Pulsifer:

Talking about successful completion in the administration in rating we're going to need to know again why we defined it and what the successful completion administration of prior grants mean so we defined that and an applicant would get points if an applicant has had a prior project open within the last five years because, we, otherwise we could go back 20 or 30 years, okay, if it's in the last 5 years and if that applicant successfully completed, closed the project within 1, less than 1 extension. Because sometimes depending on the circumstances, I mean if there's a flood or a fire beyond their circumstances, or their control then they end up needing an extension, and one extension doesn't necessarily mean its bad administration. But, when they keep coming back and asking for extension after extension then it impacts.. And so we defined a good, a successful completed application with 1 or less and if they meet that criteria then they would get 5 points, so that was our justification for that.

David Moore:

Now 5 years, is that from the completion of the project or the time that the money, the grant is rewarded?

Doris Pulsifer:

If they've had an open project within the 5 years so another words they may have been awarded a project maybe 7 years ago and it was still open within 5 years.

John Savino:

On our sticker fund thing what we had stated originally was, if we changed this then I missed this but, it was supposed to be done within a year and then what we were granting was with this sticker fund money was projects that could be done within a year so we can get it out there and then if they had an extension then they had until next year.

Pete Pfeifer:

It's supposed to be almost shovel ready.

David Moore:

Right.

John Savino:

So have we changed from that?

Doris Pulsifer:

No, no, what I'm saying is say an applicant applied for a project six years ago and they completed it within a year then within the last 5 years then, so they had a project doesn't mean that they had to have projects all within the past 5 years. Maybe they had a project one year, maybe they went a couple of years and didn't have a project.



John Savino:

I think we are talking about different things here. Jeff, real quick.

Jeff Gursh:

My question, right now. When I first applied 3 years ago when you first had OHV decal grants, it was a year, you had 1 year to complete. My last one in 2011 didn't have any time line on it.

John Savino:

Where did this change and who had the authority to change it?

Jeff Gursh:

So the question for what we're working on right now would be, if I've got one that I've completed in the last 3 years, but I also have one that I've asked for 2 extensions on, or I have completed anything on them yet. How would you look at that when you're asking for points, what would you say about my grant performance if I've completed the ones that I've had for the 1 year ones and I still have an open one and I've asked for more than 2 extensions on another one. Do you look at it as combined or just.. My success has been great except the 2 that I asked for extensions on.

Doris Pulsifer:

That's a good question.

Jeff Gursh:

Would there be some explanation needed with the grant that is submitted, so that it's clear to us?

Doris Pulsifer:

I would say that maybe then it would be up to the applicant to make their case and you know it would be up to the rating team to decide, well was it justified and well they had 2 good completed projects, but they had a problem with this one was it justified. So, it would probably be a case by case.

Jeff Gursh:

So, for myself then the 1 or less would be the trigger and then if you've had more than one extension then you need to come to the Board and explain what happened so that you could get those extra points. If you agree that my reasons were sound then I could get those 5 points.

Doris Pulsifer:

So say you had 3 projects and 2 of them were great projects, so you have some history that you're a good grantee, you're responsible administrator, but, whatever, maybe there was a fire, maybe there was a flood, whatever, there was a problem with this one project that kept you from being able to complete it within the project time. Yeah, it would be up to that applicant to make that case.

John Savino:

Now there's a lot to take into consideration it's not liking having a project and several projects and working on this building here. When you got a ranger district that's, you know 100s of miles, square miles is, you may have a whole different

group working on this other project that you're putting forward then having that.  
Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

And the last one if we're going to do this is by district or Forest, not like the whole state, everybody, and so its district and Forest...

John Savino:

Yeah, you're not going to get penalized if you have a project going over here and the Cave Creek Ranger District and you want to do one over in Havasu. That's not going to be the thing; it's got to be on that district area.

Jeff Gursh:

Then for the State Land Department we would probably have to make a map for them because, they don't have districts for Forest per say and they have 9 million acres of land. So we pretty much have to split it up and you can say North, South, East, and West Forest. Because, you're going to have different people in different sections administrating things for that property.

John Savino:

I guess the way I look at it is whose doing the work, whose handling it, whose administrating it, it could all be under BLM but its different areas, different ranger districts, because they're the ones that actually doing the work now if there's, you know I can't hold Havasu responsible for what Hassayampa does, they are two different areas.

Don French:

And that can be easily justified.

John Savino:

Yeah, and that is justified and we're taking care of it. Alright, next.

Pete Pfeifer:

The last one is local needs, priorities, and disbursement or local slash regional plans that one I don't quite understand.

Don French:

I don't either.

John Savino:

That's got to be a thing for AORCC only because we don't look at the statewide. Jeff, again, don't feel like, we need this stuff from you.

Jeff Gursh:

I apologize, this one I was thinking if it was tied to the Land Managers plan, a travel management plan or travel management rule for a Forest rule district has their own plans. So that when you're saying local..

Doris Pulsifer:

Or regional.

Jeff Gursh:

Or regional plan would be the actual districts. This is more what you see in a county park that's the language they use in county parks, or city park. Because we deal with the Feds and the State Land Department they don't have the same type of language and they don't have the same type of plans. So you are looking at a special recreation plan, an EA, travel management plan that would be the language that we need to see in here rather than local\regional.

John Savino:

Okay now let's go through this, because I still don't understand this. Let's change this, local needs for priorities identified in the travel management plan.

Jeff Gursh:

You could still say SCORP because you would have to change it to meet Federal and State Land managers plans..

David Moore:

Federal or State Lands Regional plans..

Jeff Gursh:

Travel Management plans that you know is the motorized part of. SCORP is what tell you what you can do and the Feds Travel Management plan tells you what you can do on their lands.

Don French:

Do we need those in our bonus things? Is that important?

David Moore:

You don't need it.

Jeff Gursh:

Well it would be nice to have it match

Don French:

I've never read it, I've never seen it.

John Savino:

Remember this our thing that we're going by..

Jeff Gursh:

With SCORP you could say that you're trails 2000

Don French:

That's what I was thinking, Trails 2000 and I don't know when it was last updated.

Doris Pulsifer:

What the SCORP is they do surveys statewide and it's based on different populations, ages and all the different kinds of recreations are considered. But it's a statewide survey and then from that SCORP and you can go onto our website and view the last SCORP survey.

John Savino:

What we're saying is this is for our bonus thing, not for theirs.

Doris Pulsifer:

But there's an OHV component in there.

John Savino:

But it should be something like, the Arizona Trails, statewide motorized we don't put anything in our, statewide motorized 2005 Arizona Trails Plan something like that.

Doris Pulsifer:

You can..

Pete Pfeifer:

Isn't what these first three categories are really kind of carry that.

John Savino:

Yeah, they do carry that, that's where they come from. So why do we even have that?

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah you don't have to have that

Paul Katz:

Get rid of it

John Savino:

Let's talk about it because Travel Management has come up so many times that, first of all these Travel Management plans like up there in the city grade they postpone them for 5 years because of fires and stuff. Half the state doesn't have them the other half of the state, even when they have them they are contested and they go back to court. So, I don't personally, I don't feel that Travel Management Plan exist out there that isn't going to be contested.

Pete Pfeifer:

So for the time being we can just do away with that column, in the future if we start getting..

John Savino:

Yeah, if we get to that thing because hopefully when we get to the Travel Management plans on board then there's no problem and we can just say does this meet with the Travel Management rules or plan. Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

A suggestion, because 2 other people at what you put down if 2 other groups have something like this in their categories explain and have what you think it should like if you wanted a Travel Management plan in it because someone's going to pick it and it's going to show up just like this. Without any input from you saying this what it should say because we're working with Federal Land Managers does it matter what somebody else's regional plan says if it's not in the Federal Land plan

it can't be there. So to cover yourself if it has to go, if this priority belongs with the other 2 then here's what your input would be on it.

John Savino:

That makes sense. Okay, so what should our input be?

Jeff Gursh:

I would say does the SCORP have a higher priority than Travel, then your Trails 2010 plan? Which one has more weight?

Doris Pulsifer:

I would say SCORP has more weight because it covers all the recreations.

Jeff Gursh:

So our first 3 tiers are they scorp or are they Travel Management?

Doris Pulsifer:

No, this is, I would say this is Trails

Paul Katz:

All of these categories are trails

John Savino:

I could care less about all the other aspects non-motorized and stuff, what we're doing is representing motorized.

Jeff Gursh:

The first three tiers are tied to the Trails 2010 plan then your bonus point for how you use bonuses should be tied with the same trails plan

Paul Katz:

Local needs per the identified in the Trail Management Plan...

John Savino:

Isn't that already being done in the..

Paul Katz:

That's why I don't think that you necessarily need the category..

Jeff Gursh:

Take the SCORP out and leave to match the Federal management plans. That way you're covered by if it comes to this category being there you're covered letting them know that it has to be approved by Travel Management Plan.

Paul Katz:

The SCORP address it, maybe local need per the priorities identified and in the SCORP with respect to Travel Management Plan or just get rid of it. I don't know.

John Savino:

Maybe kind of elaborate on what Don was saying. This first, second, and third level priorities establishes that we meet that priority, that we're meeting this plan

because that's how we got it and so that already has that on it. If we had 0's across the board then we know that it didn't meet the plan.

Paul Katz:

I don't think we need it.

Don French:

Make a note of why we don't need it, that needs to be in it or the Travel Management Plan..

Jeff Gursh:

So a note that would say that you've covered the SCORP part of it in the first three tiers so, no matter what you do it has to match a Federal Agencies Travel Management Plan..

John Savino:

And this is where I get back to this thing, this is my thoughts. Where I feel that it's unfair because the AORCC thing, their looking at the SCORP thing, they're not looking at a motorized.

Paul Katz:

That's why I think you can take the, you don't have to award bonus points for that and I'm not sure that Parks is necessarily going to do that.

John Savino:

We if we don't, like Jeff said if we don't award bonus points or have something in there then it's going to look like...

Paul Katz:

We could have by way of an explanation that we disagree with the priority for local need for priorities. Well, I mean for that category because we feel that it is already addressed in the Travel Management Plan. In other words I don't think that it necessarily going to be in there as a mandatory bonus point.

Pete Pfeifer:

We need to make that information clear to the State Parks Board

John Savino:

Hopefully by the time it gets there State Parks Board staff and AORCC has taken it out of there

Doris Pulsifer:

Well and AORCC's not going to take it out of there, this is AORCC's recommendation

Pete Pfeifer:

Now one thing that Doris mentioned and that Paul said, was that we could write to the State Parks Board to explain our.

Paul Katz:

You know once all is said and done any one of you as individuals can either write to Bryan or all of members or the Chair of the State Parks Board

Pete Pfeifer:

Because in the past I've tried to that and we were told that we could not write or they would not give us email address for the State Parks Board

John Savino:

That's why I started going to the State Parks Board meetings, because Pete was the Chairman before I was and he wasn't able to contact them or write them or anything. It was filtered through staff and that's one of our problems the availability.

Pete Pfeifer:

So I'm just trying to make sure that in fact we can do that or how would we do that? Send it to Bryan?

Doris Pulsifer:

Send it to Bryan.

Don French:

Are you making these notes for us?

Doris Pulsifer:

I'm reading it back.

Paul Katz:

After we get through all of these we can go back and put a motion together if you want to.

John Savino:

Do we have, so what we've done so far Pete is that we've addressed the AORCC's 1,2,3,4, & 5. Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

On number 2, education program, the only thing that I would like to see is a note on there it must be different than the Game and Fish does. I don't want to duplicate what Game and Fish is already doing.

John Savino:

I agree 100% on that, that's where we have a heck of a lot more money into that.

Jeff Gursh:

The little note that I had that would cover this would be kiosks, user maps, guides, brochures, and possibly a State Parks website where you can actually download GPS track logs of the new trails and different places. But that's the kind of education stuff I'm thinking of from our side of the money. Then Game and Fish is more the

David Moore:

But then again let's get into that, let's take a look at that when you mentioned Kiosk, I went over to it, second level priority under D, we have provide educational programs. We are already giving points there so all of a sudden you say well they have Kiosk and...

Jeff Gursh:

It's not the Kiosk itself it's the maps and stuff that you put in them and that's like a trail or a facility improvement but the things that you put into it, you Tread Lightly or whatever else you put inside the Kiosk that would be the educational materials outside.

John Savino:

Okay, let me, let's go back real quick and do the second level priority on that thing and they provide educational programs. What does that mean? Pete.

Pete Pfeifer:

Well I think we need to make sure that Doris captures those comments and it says outside of the scope of what Game and Fish is doing. So that when a project comes through and it's outside of Game and Fish's. It's not Game and Fish coming in and asking for survey questions.

John Savino:

I agree 1000% on that, but I'm just going back to this thing. Didn't we already address it on level 2, section D? It says provide educational programs. So why are we giving a bonus for something that we've already given points for?

Paul Katz:

Because I can tell you what happened at the AORCC meeting, they were concerned with those types of educational programs that promote responsible and safe trail use as opposed to educational plans that might address other issues. They felt that even though they didn't put anything on law enforcement was that a lot of problems are the result of not educated people like yourself that understand what's going on there and an idiot like me that comes in and doesn't know diddly squat about..

John Savino:

Okay Paul, how do we address, because out of this scope here.. Well let me ask you this first before I go further. The Ambassador Program any monies coming into this, into the Ambassador program, any monies and all monies going into the Ambassador Program going forward, do they come through this grant process? Because if they don't where does it get addressed in here that. Because I'm looking at it, and that's where AORCC needs to look at where we're putting the responsibility, where we're doing educational programs, we're putting all this money into this. Where's this addressed in this process?

Doris Pulsifer:

If you remember in the last grant cycle that was part of the recommendation to make it all part of the, all to go through the grant cycle.



John Savino:

Real quick the Chair recognizes that Kent Ennis just came in; he's our State Parks representative, guru. So welcome Kent.

Kent Ennis:

Sorry I'm late; I had a meeting at the governor's office to talk about our upcoming budget.

John Savino:

Okay great, we are just in the process of going over the bonus section of this rating system.

Kent Ennis:

Great!

John Savino:

Feel free to just anytime just to raise your hand and we will address you. Okay, Doris, I'm sorry, what were you saying about this last, before your boss came in, and shook you up. You see where I'm going with this thing, because we're dumping over a third of our budget into the Ambassador program already. How is this addressed in this and does AORCC when they look at it, do they see that other side that we're dumping that money into? This is State Parks grant projects money, not Game and Fish so here we're dumping over a third of OHV money into Game and Fish, with the education and the law enforcement. Then we're taking a third of our entire money for projects and dumping it into education and law enforcement what do we..

Paul Katz:

Well I just had two suggestions, one is you could either eliminate the category or you could say education programs promoting responsible and safe trail use and not funded by Game and Fish.

David Moore:

Or the Ambassador..

Paul Katz:

Or the Ambassador program. I mean that's how you can put it, or not already funded by Game and Fish or the Ambassador program..

Doris Pulsifer:

But if the Ambassador projects are going to go through this, how are we...

John Savino:

Well and you didn't answer me on that. Is, are all Ambassador Money and when I look at Ambassador Money I don't just look at the money that is for fifteen thousand dollars to the ride now corporation, I look at all the administrative money because that's money that is going out to. You got to look at that whole picture are all those, does all that funding come through the projects money that we're going to this or are we going to keep that a separate deal like its been and then if it is a separate deal then how do we figure that in there?

Pete Pfeifer:

Yeah, because its kind of taken on a role of its own and we're asked to expand and give us a half a million dollars to expand the Ambassador Program and its sort of a lump sum kind of thing

Doris Pulsifer:

I'm trying to remember back to when we were awarding the grants and I thought that it was agreed that the Ambassador grants would have to go through the same criteria.

John Savino:

Well it did, the Ambassador grant, now the extensions, fifteen thousand dollars for an extension, what wasn't agreed on and what we didn't do was for the administration part of it, Chris Gammage, and Marge Dwyer and the other people up north and pay them and what was actually done in truth we looked at and approved for Chris Gammage and Marge Dwyer but then it came back and because at that time it slipped out and we're reducing the budget and so that's great. But in turn what it was when it came to the gentleman, Mr. Kline up north his wasn't figured in there and it wasn't going to be part of this grant process. So we have to get on the same page and have it all and say here's a budget that we're establishing for the Ambassador program and for x amount of dollars for this year, that's administration, the whole nine yards and then go from there. Then getting back to this when you look at a thing that AORCC's going to do for education programs promoting responsible trail use, if they don't know that we're already dumping all this money into education programs because that's what the Ambassador program was supposed to do, if they don't know that then..

Don French:

Well that's what you're saying is that it shouldn't be a priority because we're already dumping all this money into it...

Doris Pulsifer:

Just take it out.

Paul Katz:

Just take it out and rationalize it by stating that we already doing this it's a level one priority and the Ambassador program is covering it.

Don French:

And that it goes into Game and Fish.

Doris Pulsifer:

Yes, it's already addressed.

Paul Katz:

Yeah it's already addressed in the level one as well as through the Ambassador Program and Game and Fish.

John Savino:

So my fifteen minutes of talking that was easiest thing.

Pete Pfeifer:

So we have it on tape and will make sure to

David Moore:

Our feelings is that that's a redundant thing that has already been awarded..

John Savino:

Why didn't you say that earlier?

David Moore:

I said it an hour ago before our break.

John Savino:

Let it at this time 11:30 am, let it be known that our director, State Parks Director, Bryan Martyn has joined us. So, Bryan feel free at any time to, let me know if you want to get involved in this discussion and then please get involved. In fact I would appreciate it if you would. Where we are in this process right now is that we've already looked at our rating form, gone through the first part of the numbers thing and we are on our bonus section, and we are just trying to do this, and a lot of this has to do with it. And I would like the input from AORCC on this which Paul has been kind enough to give us because, he attended the meeting. We had just talked about the AORCC's priority two on the bonus thing, the education part that they have as a bonus thing and what we had brought up was that they, one of the things that and we decide to drop it off of that the reason why is because we're already dumping a third of our, a third of the money, projects money into the Ambassador Program. So, and that's an education intended to be an education and enforcement thing, so that's got to be considered into that thing along with that, looking at the big picture when Game and Fish get 35% of the total monies that are given out, then that's for law enforcement and education so we wanted to differ from that. If we do have an education thing then we look at our second level Priority where we proved educational programs, that's projects that are different educational programs, then what Game and Fish provides. They are mandated to that, they get a third of the entire money, so if we are going to do something it's going to be different then what they're doing. Or them coming to us and saying that you need educational programs so give us your money. So that's where we are.

Bryan Martyn:

Mr. Chairman, thanks for being so gracious with that introduction, it's really not required. These documents represent Off Highway professionals, users in the State of Arizona, what you come up with for your criteria, based on your justification is yours. It does not have to match AORCC's and does not have to match staff, it has to be within law, but it does not have to match exactly and I think it's best if it doesn't match. Because, when the body will decides awarding based on your recommendation, they will have the ability to look at your recommendation and know that this was evaluated from your perspective and not AORCC's perspective or staffs perspective and that will carry the weight of professionals. So it's important that you not fear going down that path in my opinion, if I were on the Board to decide and I had three recommending bodies, because that's what you are. You are not a body of 7 or 8, you are 1, and you

represent 1 packet and I know when I look at that packet. Well what do the users think? Okay the users think this is good idea or a bad idea and why. Okay, cool. What does AORCC think? Good idea, bad idea. What does staff think? And then I have all of the information that I need as a Board member to make an educated decision, one way, or another, educated vote. You always have that ability like I said to lobby, after your decisions made as a body you can lobby, you can lobby the OHV Coordinator which we are in the processing of hiring, how many applications did we get? 70? 80?

Doris Pulsifer:

85.

Bryan Martyn:

85, thank you, fantastic! Thank you very much for that. That's good; you will be able to lobby through that individual or directly through me, just putting that out there. You can be like damn it Bryan that is a bad idea, and let me tell you why. That's cool, that is what I want to hear, and I will relay that information as well to Board members, that the users are very passionate about this particular grant and this is why, they disagree with AORCC, they disagree with staff, and this is why. That's it that's all you got, that way you know that your voice was heard. Is the decision going to be what you think, I don't know. If it is great, if it isn't then get over it. Don't write about it on the damn website, talk about that you had your voice, that's what's important, so when you come up with this document today, today when you meet Jesus on this document today I need to know your opinions are represented, however you do that.

Don French:

The problem that I see with your plan here is that we talked about this earlier before you got here. We're sitting here discussing this stuff and it's amazing how many facts that come up that I don't think AORCC's aware of and that the Board's going to be aware of. I mean like this one situation with the promoting the education and stuff. I guess the point is that these three groups aren't getting together and having the discussion.

Bryan Martyn:

I don't want you to! I don't want you to, you represent individual bodies of information. I need to know that you're opinion of this issue is not influencing one way or the other, that's just how it works.

Don French:

But if we're sitting here with state parks, we've seen things that they've come up with that we agree with and the same with us. We've come up with a lot of good ideas, just being able to...

Bryan Martyn:

And I'm not saying that it's wrong to do that. Obviously the more discussion about an issue the more educated decision you have. But, that's a complete other step in the process, we don't have the time, the laws not set up that way.

Paul Katz:

And if I might interject if you don't mind.

Bryan Martyn:

Sure, go ahead.

Paul Katz:

Mr. Chairman as I expressed, I was at that very first AORCC meeting and had a review with them, their legislative role they already knew that, but, as it relates to Off-Highway vehicle usage. And they said we would like to get strong deference to the community of users but they also recognize that they have an independent responsibility. This is going to be an educational process, we're probably going to have to go through a couple of cycles, before OHVAG gets an idea of what AORCC is responsible for and AORCC really gets an idea of what the users expect with respect to that. And the Parks department is responsible to all the parks users after hearing from all of this, good faith advisors.

Bryan Martyn:

I can't emphasize enough the narrative, the narrative that goes from this body relative to your decision, one way or support or denial or recommend or not. That narrative is what sets you apart. What does the OHVAG community think? Cause you're not going to get everything in here. With all three bodies you're going to come up with this great thing, we definitely made the right decision here. I don't disagree that's a great way to do it, but we don't have that kind of time and it's not setup. Just need to know that you are the best..

John Savino:

Bryan we want to work on something here, figure out something, what we had the dilemma in the past if we voted we had the grant in front of us and we said we all agreed that we don't want to pass this grant and you've always been there and said you have to come up with a reason, well in the time frame we didn't have time to sit there and write out whole explanation and whose going to do that. I was hoping that our State Parks coordinator would take that information from us and put it together and compile it with..

Bryan Martyn:

You have a coordinator and a planner, and you know that planner represents both vehicle and non, and they're not all funded by you, we got that cleared up. By all means you've got that piece available to you. But, if you don't put a reason down you do the Board a disservice, I mean why don't they want to fund it? Well they just don't like it, well I'm like what the hell am I going to do with that?

John Savino:

That will never happen..

Bryan Martyn:

It's happened before. It's happened before.. Oh, I don't like these guys, they can't make this project happen.

John Savino:

Same time Bryan, okay what's happened, Now I'm going to throw it back at you and you can open it. Okay, what happened this last time was we voted for Havasu, we voted for Snowflake for the racing thing, we all agreed on it, we had our

reasons why we thought it went forward, we voted on it. Then State Parks, then you guys turned it down.

Bryan Martyn:

Great example, let me tell you how this works in the real world.

John Savino:

Please.

Bryan Martyn:

Your decision if you don't write a narrative you do yourself a disservice a decision body believe it or not has no obligation to tell you the way they vote and why I'm saying I agree or disagree with that because I've been on the other side of the table. I don't have to tell you why I agree or disagree, legally. I don't have to give that to you, is it in my best interest, yeah, especially when I think I'm going to read about it in the Arizona Republic. So it would behoove the Board to know why they vote against you. We can, they can say we support staffs recommendation, we support AORCC recommendation, we support OHVAG recommendation, because surely all three of you will not always agree on every issue. The bottom line John is, excuse me, Mr. Chairman, you get your say, you get your say. But you are not the decision maker, and I've got to get the narrative down there, nail down the numbers, I don't care about the numbers.

John Savino:

We've remedied this problem because by hiring a coordinator to do that, one of our issues were we couldn't put down the narrative, we discussed it in our meeting, in our OHVAG meeting we all discussed what the narrative was. But, we didn't have the time sit down and come up with a narrative to give to them. We figured we thought that out of minutes that that narrative was enough to go forward, now with the coordinator that solves all the issues and we'll be done with that.

Bryan Martyn:

It's important to note that you represent a body and that you're narrative up or down will be from the body I don't want to see a, we just approve of this and then somebody writes a positive or they agree with an issue, it must match your numbers

John Savino:

Going forward there won't be a problem.

Bryan Martyn:

Alright John, because I know in this room right here there are different opinions, with the just the little knowledge that I have of the men at this table, some people agree or disagree with different issues. You represent a body so when you come up with your vote you move forward.

John Savino:

You won't have that problem anymore .

Bryan Martyn:

Alright

Paul Katz:

One of the other things that we did discuss earlier was that I was hoping to get this process not that it's been adopted running more smoothly so that ultimately the recommendations of all three groups after independently made will be known to one another well in advance of the Park Board making its decision so that letters or phone calls could be made or people could attend the public meeting.

Bryan Martyn:

That's humongous and I encourage you, if you know that your opinion differs from AORCC or staff which you will after the fact and will have to run through a time line and the coordinator will coordinate all that. You will need, at that point say alright why did AORCC think that this was a good idea and then the OHV coordinator can go to the narrator, they don't speak for AORCC they will write well AORCC thought that it passed this, this, and this and AORCC was wrong. Great, what does staff think? Staff thought this, well staff was wrong, like, alright, time for you to start talking to the coordinator and talking to the director, so I can, so the coordinator can go and talk to the Board and when it comes time to make this recommendation, I can say AORCC and the staff agreed with it, OHVAG disagreed with it and let me tell you why.

John Savino:

Bryan, I expressed this to you before and I expressed this earlier in the meeting that I want to hear staff's side of it. Because there's stuff that I may be missing.

Bryan Martyn:

Staff is technical...

John Savino:

I want to hear that. Okay, I'm still not sold on the idea of here but I have to roll with it because it's state law, I'm not sold on AORCC's side of it because it's not motorized. But that's another story, but, I want to hear that input, and then because they may come across with a different opinion then we have and they may change my mind.

Bryan Martyn:

And I don't disagree with that, you have to, your decision is your decision, and you know more information may come up from AORCC but I can't adjust the timeline and you may hear it before AORCC, you may hear it after AORCC that's just the way it is. Staff, staff's not going to fill this out for you, staff is about technical questions, if you have a question staff will be graded before you get to them. Staff will have these graded first, it's mostly on technical, you'll have a question, hey how did you grade this how did you quote. And the OHV coordinator should be able to clearly articulate staff's recommended this be it a 8 or a 7 or a 6 or whatever you can go into that kind of detail based on this. And you can say, we completely disagree with that and staff would say, that's your prerogative.

John Savino:

Where I have trouble and I think we should put into our bonus area and I'll bring up an example you were involved in this thing, and that was the Desert Wells project. Okay, the Desert Wells program, what we did was, what I did for instance, I called Jeff Gursh, I called several other people that were involved in that area and I got club opinions on it, user opinions on that and that's how I came up with my decision. We have to put that and that has to be an emphasis on our bonus thing and when we come to a project and what we would do is we would call up the different areas like a user group in Havasu and we have that and that's why we come up with that so how do we come up with an area like that. The Chair recognizes Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

If we got back to the sections we were talking about under 4 on the AORCC priorities, where it says community support, if it was OHV community support or partnerships from the OHV community.

John Savino:

That I like better because community support just doesn't.. How do we write that out? How would you put it? OHV Partnership support?

Jeff Gursh:

Community\OHV Partnership..

John Savino:

I like that, Doris would you take that into consideration?

Doris Pulsifer:

Okay, so your priority four would be community support defined as OHV community and OHV partnership.

David Moore:

OHV Community\Partnership support, OHV Partnership.

Bryan Martyn:

Mr. Chairman

John Savino:

Yes sir.

Bryan Martyn:

This is your document, I don't care what you write in there, you have to articulate your message to the Board, this is the tool that you are using to articulate your message. If you have to write a five page narrative to an addition that's part of the packet, you always have that option. Come up with a score that works for you and that's snapshot if I really want to dig down into this thing there's narrative and oh by the way I can look at individual score sheets.

John Savino:

Mr. Director, Bryan, you call me John. Okay, the world according to John what I thought is that if a grant comes forward and it's for the Tucson area, we have a



person that's living in Tucson, we contact, I can contact him and say, Pete would you please go out and what do you think about this project. Go out and look at it and tell me and then that person whether, if he feels that the project isn't worthy of it then we feel that he should be responsible for writing that narrative that would go into that thing.

Paul Katz:

Just to define the process if I might we are right now trying to define the criteria and where we're changing it, we're having short explanations. When we are actually processing the grants will be the time to have longer narratives as to why you think this project is worth more than this project because of the following reason and you can get subjective even though we're doing it objectively saying this one gets it and this one doesn't. But then we need to have an explanation as to why, and we need to do a better job at that during the grant approval process, once we got the process refined.

Bryan Martyn:

If you don't it only counts against yourself, if you go down there and you say this project sucks. This body when it comes forward I expect it to have a low score and a narrative, you know he went out and looked at it and it didn't meet this, this, this, and this based on the criteria you can expound, I don't care. And that way when that comes before the Board, comes before me, because I'm going to read all these, comes before me and I can be like alright the community went out and looked at it and it didn't meet this. Then I'll make my phone calls, okay, John tell me about this, Jeff, tell me about this, Doris tell me about this, you know I have people out there. Does this meet or doesn't it or is somebody just pissed off at somebody, which has happened tell me okay and that way I validate your opinion. Based on my and it still stands, the Board does that it's not my vote.

John Savino:

I would like to address something real quick if I can, Paul please tell me if I'm getting off target, okay.

Bryan Martyn:

Good for you congratulations, well done.

John Savino:

Since you brought up with Jeff, I have to get it out in the open, we are your, correct me if I'm wrong. The Off Highway Advisory for State Parks is your Off Highway Vehicle Advisory Group, not the collation or the Arizona Trail riders association. Now whether you go to them or not that's neither here nor there cause I can't stop you from reaching out to anybody. But I feel that Arizona Off Highway Vehicle Advisory Group is your advisory group and that's the way it should be. So, I take offense at times when you go out and you meet on a project, because, Jeff, and I'm being honest. Jeff Gursh is writing these grants and he's also the coalition trail riders is making money off of these grants by doing the work on it.

Jeff Gursh:

Whoa, whoa, I make a little more than fifty cents an hour on this, like thirty-nine hours, still it was a profit.

John Savino:

I'm just saying we have to separate things, we're your advisory group now and get rid of us if you don't like our advice, but we have to be there.

Bryan Martyn:

Mr. Chairman, John, you'll notice that when I said when I gave my example who was the first person that I said I'd call? Was anybody paying attention to the order of the names that I said?

John Savino:

Wait you said..

Bryan Martyn:

The first name that I said was John. That's why I said I'm going to call John, and I'm going to call Jeff, I'm going to call Doris, I'm going to call other people in the community. So my first call is to the Chairman of OHVAG, the Chairman that's the first call that I'm going to make. Tell me about this, why, and then I'm going to expand my universe, so you are the advisory group, but you are not the only show in town. That's your role that State Parks has given you and I respect that and I will honor that. But I'm going to, it would not be wise of me because I know that there is more than one opinion, it's just such a huge community, make a couple of more phone calls, you know tell me more about this, why is this a good idea, why is it a bad idea.

John Savino:

And it depends and we have our inner issues in it here, when we don't participate, some of those folks have like seven members but only four show up, then we have our quorum and our inner issues in our board so we don't have. In order to have, to give you a fair shake on giving you a thing we have to step up to the plate also.

Bryan Martyn:

Remember as far as I'm concerned you're not individuals, when it comes to me you are one body, you're one, you're one. You get four to show up oh well, you get seven to show up, oh well, I'm not getting into your business, you represent one. Individual phone calls, I'll do that, but a body, you are 4 or 7, I don't care. So, it's up to you, excuse me, give me a minute Mr. Chairman.

John Savino:

Where were we

Pete Pfeifer:

Earlier we talked about state forms, basically being homogenized.

John Savino:

Yes they want to totally separate going forward, so with what

Don French:

I didn't hear that

Doris Pulsifer:

That's what he said, that's what I was trying to tell you that they want three separate recommendations.

Don French:

I thought they wanted three separate to go to the Board for their approval.

John Savino:

That's right but we should have without a (inaudible).. We still have, we still should have that first part of that thing because at this point I don't care if it's AORCC, or whoever it is because they still have to go by this first part, first, second, and third. Bryan I need your input on this, because, what we're talking about here is that this first. You had mentioned that you want three separate recommendations, it could be all the same, but you want three separate recommendations going to the Board. Okay? The first part of this, the first part all the groups should be similar, on the same page, not as far as the number rating system but as far as whether it's on the first priority, second, and third that should all be the same and it goes to all the groups.

Bryan Martyn:

Okay, I'm hearing from Paul that by statute they all have to be the same.

Paul Katz:

Right

John Savino:

So that's all the same there now if they put in different numbers then...

David Moore:

That is our input..

Bryan Martyn:

Amen.

David Moore:

They have nothing to do with any of these

Bryan Martyn:

And that's good but, as far as the basic criteria you can call them all you want, I expect this body to grade appropriately, your grades do not have to match anybody's.

Paul Katz:

Right, we understand that

John Savino:

I understand that but we want to be on the same playing field

Bryan Martyn:

The areas where you have legal authority to specify of what your thoughts are, I encourage you to make those as accurate as possible.

Pete Pfeifer:

So the numbers can be different

Paul Katz:

The criteria, the twelve criteria have to be the same, but the numbers and the grading scale can be different and your bonuses can be completely different and then when we get to the evaluation that's a separate process.

John Savino:

Okay, Don.

Don French:

Just make sure that I understand this, you're looking for three separate sheets to go to the Board to evaluate and come up with one sheet. Is that correct?

Bryan Martyn:

No, the Board won't have a sheet; the Board just gets three packets.

Paul Katz:

The Board, Bryan if I might, the Board is going to have to give staff ultimately the grant criteria and the sheet that we're going to use before we sent out the request for grant applications. In other words we are just trying to develop grant criteria right now, and the grant criteria will come from three different sources. The Board will essentially come up with the grant criteria and how it gets scored.

John Savino:

One Sheet

Paul Katz:

One sheet

John Savino:

For everybody

Doris Pulsifer:

What I'm thinking is that the Board will receive three different recommendations and they will look at this and maybe decide well we like this part of AORCC's priority 1, 2, & 3, but maybe we don't agree with number 4. But, we like OHVAG's 3, 4, & 5, what I'm thinking is that the Board may come up with maybe six or seven priorities categories from all of us.

Bryan Martyn:

Let me ask a question. Why does the decision authority need to have a grant sheet?

Paul Katz:

If you start getting away from a categorized number system

Bryan Martyn:

Well we have that in place, so recommendations, does the Board have...

Paul Katz:

Here's what happened, because ultimately we're going to have these, folks are going to have to evaluate, AORCC's going to have to evaluate, and staff's going to have to evaluate the grants based upon a list of criteria that gets adopted by the Board.

Don French:

If I can...

John Savino:

Don

Don French:

The grant manual that tells these people when their filling out, the writers for the grants how to fill these things out and what's the priority and if we don't base that on one sheet then..

Doris Pulsifer:

We can't write a manual

Paul Katz:

There's a two stage process, one is to come up with an objective for the grant criteria whatever that might be some of it mandatory some of it discretionary, the scoring discretionary, and then the second process is after the manual is published and the grant applications are solicited there will be the evaluations by these ladies and gentlemen, AORCC, and staff.

Bryan Martyn:

Well that throws a little wrench in my thought process. And I understand why you do this for the grant, how you write your grant. Do you write your grant for the AORCC guy? Do you write the grant for the OHVAG guys? Do you write the grant for staff? Gosh dang it that just threw another process.

Doris Pulsifer:

But what I'm saying is that in the end when the Board looks at all three of the recommendations they may decide at the end of the day we liked OHVAG's base points and they adopt that but, because your bonus priorities and maybe AORCC's and maybe ours we may all agree on maybe 2 or 3 of them. The ones that we all agree on we don't have to argue it's the ones that are different and those are the ones that I'm saying the Board won't be able to either adopt all of them; maybe they liked all of yours, and they like all of AORCCs.

John Savino:

You're getting away from it being our, for the bonus points, our bonus points and then their bonus points. I know you have to have, you have to have the same, you either have fifteen bonus categories and because you have a different flavor for AORCC, you have a different flavor for OHVAG and you have a different flavor for State Parks. So there's fifteen different categories there now they pick and choose which ones they fell into but, they have to know what bonus points are out there

and available to them. So you'll probably have fifteen different ones. Five for us, they may not be fifteen because we may be identical on some.

Doris Pulsifer:

You're agreeing on, actually you're agreeing on most of them.

John Savino:

But the ones, it's going to expand, but we have to have them all listed on there, otherwise they don't know what bonus points are, that they can apply for.

Doris Pulsifer:

I mean they're going to look at all the bonus points and the ones that we don't disagree on then the Board's going to look at those closer, they're going focus on those and say you know maybe OHVAG's got a point here and maybe we don't need priority points, take that one out. Or you know what maybe you have a point, maybe we need to keep those in there. This is where you guys are going to make your case to the Board.

Don French:

The Board wants to sit there and listen to all that?

David Moore:

Its information that's all that we're giving them and maybe she's right, maybe reducing these things maybe just add more per category.

Doris Pulsifer:

And the bottom line is that whatever you take forward to the Board, like I'm telling you, you need to justify. AORCC's basing theirs on because of State Trails Plan does or the statute says, you guys whatever priorities that you come up with make sure that you back it up with something.

Paul Katz:

And to bring us back down to earth, the four things that I took notes on is you all seem to agree that first time applicants get bonus points, that community/OHVAG community supports rather just general community support gets a priority. Prior Off Highway vehicle success and sustainability those were basically the four areas that were agreed to and you then might come up with some additional, I mean there's four areas that I saw that you haven't put into a motion yet, that you were in agreement on, and then you can...

Don French:

4 or 5

Paul Katz:

Well sustainability, first time..

Don French:

Well there's three different sheets there..

Paul Katz:

Well they eliminated education..

(Inaudible)

Don French:

He's looking at the staff not the AORCC.

John Savino:

And we added on project sustainability that's what State Parks has on there's.

Paul Katz:

What you had come up, so far at least, if I'm hearing you correctly was consensus that sustainability would be criteria, a first time applicant, a prior off-highway vehicle project success, and OHVAG community support.

John Savino:

Yes, now whether they go forward with the thing or not OHVAG, OHV community support.

Paul Katz:

Right you were going to change community to support.

Doris Pulsifer:

You're just defining it a little bit.

John Savino:

They want to stay on the same thing and.

Doris Pulsifer:

Defining it is all that you are doing

Paul Katz:

You're defining it. And then you need to decide, I mean we can put this all in a motion, what if any additional bonus categories. You've eliminated 2 and I think you have agreed to 4.

John Savino:

Does anyone have any other bonus categories that they want to talk about? Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

Oh, I'm sorry....

David Moore:

I just think that there would be a benefit and I felt this way since I became a member, give some extra bonus to the projects that have a visible benefit to the actual user, not that all these don't. Some of these projects in the past, some are administrative, some have been other things, but the projects were for the regular people. This is cool, this is where my sticker money went and should have a little bit of a priority to it.

John Savino:

And I see what you are saying and hopefully with our discussion that we had with Bryan, and I'm not saying hopefully and he said he's going to do it and he's going to do it. Is that one of the problems that we had was that we had no visibility out

there and we had nothing to say when we purchased the UTVs for the Coconino County Sheriffs, we stipulated that we wanted to have stickers put on them that said that these are coming from, and I went up and I looked at them and they didn't have stickers on them, there's nothing..

Jeff Gursh:

How much did we spend? Three-thousand?

Doris Pulsifer:

We have some on order for them.

John Savino:

Okay, so you have that and that has been taken care of. All of our projects, I see what you are saying, that we need on the ground visibility.

David Moore:

I don't just mean a sticker that says I mean the actual place instead of project, you know the ones that people are going to use and see everyday should be given a little bit of a priority.

John Savino:

So how do we do that in our bonus area?

Doris Pulsifer:

If you're going to give that extra points make sure that you define visible what visible is, so you want to say visible on the ground projects.

John Savino:

Well that could be..

Doris Pulsifer:

Because otherwise

John Savino:

On every trail up there we put diamonds up on the things; we could put diamonds up on the trails that say this is funded by this, is that visible on the ground? We need to make it clear to the Board what we're talking about when we say on the ground visibility

Doris Pulsifer:

To make it clear put yourself in the place of the raters, you're a rater what are you going to base that decision on, it's not so much the Board it's the raters.

Pete Pfeifer:

When I read through these levels 1's, 2's, 3's, and all that stuff, protect access to trails and acquire land, and public access, maintain and renovate existing trails and realms mitigate and surrounding trails, routes and areas establish (inaudible) increase on the ground management, law enforcement provide and install trail routes, provide education information and develop facilities promote volunteerism create comprehensive planning (inaudible)..



David Moore:

Maybe I was thinking it could be a bonus thing for high use areas, because that is where the public sees it, I don't know. And maybe projects that are in the area that are already, that have already seen traffic, and you know those kinds of things would give us that kind of recognition. Maybe that's how that has to be.

John Savino:

Don, Chair recognizes Don.

Don French:

How about based on usage something you know, like you guys were talking about, but I was thinking like Standard Wash, it's a high, high use area in the winter time and it's had no improvements what so ever. So I don't know exactly how to put it in there but the fact that high usage area that should get some priority because..

David Moore:

Absolutely because from time to time if you look at the area Sycamore Creek and Four Peaks and the Rolls and those areas you know the number of people that are out there doing something every weekend, every day is big. And projects that are done in those places you are going to have many more people that recognize that this is where we spend our money then you are if you do a project in the Hualapai's.

John Savino:

But you also have to take into consideration spreading it around, spreading the wealth...

David Moore:

I understand...

John Savino:

Around the state, people down in Yuma, which we haven't done a thing a down there in years, they put into this same fund, so we need to spread it around the state.

David Moore:

I understand,

Don French:

There's also high usage areas

John Savino:

Chair recognizes Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

One of the, under category 5 of, I had first time applicants and also new areas and under new areas you can define new area as a new OHV area, basically a new riding area.

John Savino:

In the last five years

Jeff Gursh:

It's actually a new one so say you're down in Yuma and their looking there's a section close to the river and between a new community that's getting a lot of use and they want to develop that now as an actual site through the BLM. That would fall under a new area, it would be high profile and it would get your program out there where people see it. Because, most folks are never going to see and understand that the new trail sign came from the OHV program, but a new riding area with facilities and stuff that would be.

John Savino:

You know we, I look at the picture here and I go back to mitigating thing, an example go back to the new community thing they come popping up all over the state, especially in the rural area. A new community comes in, they all of a sudden have an issue with OHV use and it's disturbing the community itself. It's our obligation to go out there and mitigate that and put some of our funding into that to see, to develop an area, or keep it away from there by you know by working with it and, it's under mitigation or is that under new area. Go ahead, Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

Under, when we do a grant you I sit down with the Bureau Land Management they have it identify as the a project before we can write a grant for it so they're going to look at, look here's an area that's not being used you have to buy a social use that's not acceptable and not something that's not in the plans. We like to do grant to make trails and manage for it the mitigation that's going to come with it project is going to be, fix the things that don't have trails in the new plan and then build the new trails and then put signs and fences to keep people out of the areas that you didn't want them. So I repaired things that were being damaged that's the mitigation but the new part of the project the actual trail system that would fall under your bonus category under new.

John Savino:

Gotcha, Doris.

Doris Pulsifer:

One thing in AORCC's discussion and going back to AORCC's priority 1 their local need, what you may want do because that was kind of the thought behind AORCC is that maybe new areas out there that have never been developed and given priority and maybe in your recommendation maybe, I know you don't want to go with AORCC's priority one but maybe say, replace it because you're in essence saying the project should receive priority points because the need is there. There has been area developed for OHV the need is there maybe replace it with your recommendation. You don't agree with wording or how its defined by AORCC but, you're in essences saying you want to give points because its needed because its brand new, it's never been used.

John Savino:

How would you word that? Now that we're taking State Parks..

Doris Pulsifer:

But what I'm saying is that your definition would be priorities for new areas, then in your justification explain, you disagree with AORCC's definition for local need, however a new area you're defining local need as a new area, under used areas, something along those lines.

Jeff Gursh:

This went back to where we talked about, their covered under 1, 2, 3, if you said it was a local need based on travel management plans from federal or state agencies. That would as a travel management plan comes out they would identify places new OHV trails like we did at table Mesa and that and you could actually make that a priority. Because you're all going to be in places that are outside the norm because, we've already developed most of the big places already. So it's going to be the Yuma's, and the Kingman's and the Havasu's that have these new clients.

Doris Pulsifer:

Should we further define that and say based on travel management plans with preference for new areas?

Jeff Gursh:

Maybe that would eliminate the new category.

Pete Pfeifer:

I have a question just a basic on, what is the record of all these things? I mean Jeff's got a lot of good stuff written down here and there's been a lot of good things discussed ..

John Savino:

Those two little machines there.

Doris Pulsifer:

When were done I'm going to reread everything I have to make sure that I have the intent down because I need to forward it in the report. So, when we are done we are going to reread everything to make sure that you guys agree with what I'm forwarding.

John Savino:

Will be until we get a coordinator which we're in the process of working on those two little tapes there are what's going to go forward and she is going to decipher through all those, our discussion and come up with..

Paul Katz:

But essentially what you are going to need to do once we define the bonus area is maybe have two separate motions, one to adopt the bonuses that you wanted to have adopted, the 4, 5, & 6 of them, and then how you want them scored.

John Savino:

What I would like to do is I like to get through these and finalize our bonus points and break for lunch and then have Doris sit here through lunch and not have

lunch. And then we come up with some kind of agreement then we can make a motion and go forward.

Bryan Martyn:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the direction that you are heading on this, you got this please finish this today.

John Savino:

We are going to get it done today, I guarantee you.

Bryan Martyn:

Thank you for all your help on all, every front, really, I appreciate it , appreciate you working through this and spread the word, spread the good word about what State Parks is doing together.

John Savino:

Did you get the message that I apologized?

Bryan Martyn:

I did get the message that you apologized.

John Savino:

That came out after..

Bryan Martyn:

I know that, don't let it happen again, I got hit all over the place for that.

John Savino:

It worked then didn't it?

[Laughing all at once]

Bryan Martyn:

That wasn't the intent it was so that we're working together,

John Savino:

That was after the fact

Bryan Martyn:

I know. So, thank you again..

John Savino:

Thank you

David Moore:

I have a one thing that I wanted to mention real quick, I was reading in the bonus from the staff under the section for first time applicants, they have further defined the first time applicants as those that want to demonstrate their project, fills the gap between supply and demand. That's really different than just a first time applicant because that's a first time applicant that's a special, agenda or whatever you want to say. A project that fills a gap between supply and demand I think is worthy of a special category. But, in addition to that I think anybody that puts

together a qualifying grant application for the first time should get the five bonus points. So, my thinking is as a whole new category should be one that fills gaps.

Paul Katz:

Either that or

John Savino:

Paul, did you have something?

Paul Katz:

No I just didn't know if you wanted to have it as a separate category or have just a first time applicant without the qualifications.

David Moore:

Without qualifications. You could add a category that says a project that fills a gap between supply and demand is worthy of its own bonus category. You shouldn't have to fill supply and demand to be a first time, I think we are looking for anyone that could fill the.

John Savino:

What I want is a suggestion from you.

David Moore:

My suggestion is that looking at what staff is done for the first time applicants that we leave the category for first time applicants and take their restrictions that they have listed and their suggestion and make that a new category meaning a project that fills gaps between supply and demand should be its own bonus category.

Pete Pfeifer:

The only question I have is what do they mean by supply and demand? Do they mean like a need in the community?

Doris Pulsifer:

I provided some examples.

John Savino:

Excuse me a second, grant writer how would you take that supply and demand?

Jeff Gursh:

It sounds more like a material thing than, like, I don't have enough trails. Am I supplying you new trails? Because there is a higher demand, is that what that means? Or does it mean there are not enough trail signs and I'm filling the gap and installing them for you and putting them in.

John Savino:

Ok, now I'd like to have staff tell us what your reasons were.

Doris Pulsifer:

I put in some examples and I think probably if we were to go with this and that's what the Board approves, we would have to have a definition in the manual. The suggestion was, for example, demand for this type of recreation by community

users so it would be based on the demand whatever you got newspapers articles or letters saying users are demanding this, they want this, there is a lack of this recreation opportunity. Another one would be close to home opportunities maybe there is you know the closest OHV area is fifty miles away. There is a demand, ok. Connectivity, the demand is there because you want to connect it to other trails or trail networking. Maybe the need resolves user conflicts between recreational users, the demand is there because currently what is available is conflicting with other recreation uses so the demand is there. You need your own area.

Paul Katz:

It seems to me though we're getting back again to local need but not necessarily based upon the SCORP criteria. So maybe just have it as local need based upon whatever

Doris Pulsifer:

Based on supply and demand. Local need based on supply and demand.

Paul Katz:

Well, yeah leave it for first time applicants.

John Savino:

Then we're getting complicated but if you want to have it for other.

Doris Pulsifer:

The bottom line is how many priorities do you want, I mean, what's really, really important. Pick out what's really, really important to you and stick with those.

John Savino:

First time applicants, that's an important thing to me. Spreading the wealth around the state, that's important to me. Spreading the wealth around to different user groups is important to me. I'm taking the and I'll give you the example, a single tract up in Coconino County, we haven't touched that so that's important to me, spreading the wealth around to the different user groups. Those things are the important things to me.

David Moore:

It's nice to have a big state and the truth is the money is centered where the population is and where the number of users are. Spread the money out accordingly that way.

John Savino:

That's where comes in the thing. I'm not saying if Jeff Gursh is their BLM in Hassayampa area is putting in grants and we see five of them come, we don't see them around the state I'm not going to say we'll we're not going to give out anymore more money because we're waiting on those to come in. We're still taking that into consideration. Where I say spreading the wealth is that if I have a Jeff Gursh that came across with a Hassayampa thing in the metropolitan Phoenix area and I have one from Yuma and I know that I've had five other ones from Jeff Gursh in the Hassayampa area in this last year, I'm going to say ok now we need to give a little bit of money here. The good thing about it is we have money to go around everywhere.

David Moore:

Well, I agree, it's just my point you know with the visibility thing and everything else, is if you have an area that whether it's already set up as a thing or not, there's 500 or 1,000 people there on any given Saturday or Sunday that you go compared to some of the other areas in the state where there's not that many people in the entire year. We need to give a preference to that because that's where the actual use is happening. Even if it's not fair that someone who lives in Safford is not getting as many trails as someone else, it's where the users are.

John Savino:

Well, what's happened in the past, the sad fact about this is that in going back in researching over the years, it's been whoever sat in this position here they benefited their own pockets. Safford for a year got all the grants and you know it works out that way. I know what you're saying about spreading it, you know, I'm not spreading it.

Paul Katz:

Just maybe one suggestion is that we have a motion that addresses sustainability, first time applicant, prior OHV program success and OHV community support. Make those bonus categories and then discuss another 1, 2, or 3. Because otherwise we're just going to be bouncing around.

John Savino:

We need to get these first items out of the way.

Paul Katz:

Right.

John Savino:

Are we clear on what the first five are going to be?

Doris Pulsifer:

All right, let me read them back. I want to make sure.

John Savino:

Yes, I'd like to have them read back and then from that I will entertain a motion.

Don French:

Have we agreed to just first time applicants without all of the

Paul Katz:

Keep first time applicants, make it first time applicants without qualification when we define it above in the footnotes.

John Savino:

Ok, Doris, would you please read off what we just said, because I have no clue.

Doris Pulsifer:

Ok. I have that OHVAG chooses to have for priority: successful completion and administration of prior OHV statewide grant projects as a priority.

Doris Pulsifer:

I do want to get clarification. If you agree with staff's definition of successful completion. One or less extension. Ok.

John Savino:

And we already had a motion back in a Tucson meeting last year that anything over one extension had to come in front of, they had to be present in front of the Board.

Doris Pulsifer:

And that's in our administrative guidelines. That has to happen anyway.

John Savino:

Ok. Go on.

Doris Pulsifer:

Second one was OHV community/partnership support.

John Savino:

Any discussion on that?

John Savino:

Ok. Well after we get them all out I'm going to ask for discussion on each one, then afterward we're going to have a motion and we'll go from there. Go to number three please.

Doris Pulsifer:

Ok. Number three was first-time applicants.

John Savino:

Period.

Doris Pulsifer:

Just first time applicants.

John Savino:

Any discussion? Ok, go on number four.

Doris Pulsifer:

Number four was project sustainability.

John Savino:

Any discussion?

Doris Pulsifer:

Again I need do you agree with staff's definition of project sustainability?

David Moore:

Just sustainability, we haven't seen a definition.



Doris Pulsifer:

If you go into the staff recommendation, we defined let's see priority five up on the top it says, bonus points will be awarded to..oh, I'm sorry, it just says project sustainability. Yeah, ok.

David Moore:

So we don't know what the definition is.

Doris Pulsifer:

Sustainability would be the applicant would need to provide you or the raters with how they intend to maintain and operate it for a reasonable amount of time based on.

John Savino:

Well it's mandated, Doris, they maintain it for 25 years. That we have that property, but now what you're talking about more so, if I may, is if we build a restroom we supply the stuff, how are they going to maintain that, do they have the ability to have the pooper-pumper come there every month or what have you. That to me is sustainability. How are you going to clean that thing after we build it for you.

Don French:

I wouldn't say that would be a bonus point then it would be mandatory to have. I mean why build it and put money into a project that they can't sustain.

John Savino:

True. Jeff?

Jeff Gursh:

From what I understand in working with the Feds, when you sign an agreement, RTP especially, it's control of ownership. You're saying you'll control the land for that type of use and you'll keep the ownership of it for the 25 years. It doesn't say that you're going to have enough money to keep the trails in repair or the infrastructure in repair. What we've done in the past is three years has been the minimum that we've said that we would maintain kiosks, restrooms, signs, as part of a grant. That's what they usually do for their upkeep. They have maintenance out for three years they'll write their plans. After that, I've come back to you for actual maintenance money for a two year program to repair those trails now that those trails are three years old.

John Savino:

Ok. Let's get back to the thing then. What is sustainability?

David Moore:

If a person came to the grant and they said you know we're going to build these but we do have funding for the long-term, then I think it would fall under that.

Doris Pulsifer:

Yes.

David Moore:

You know what I mean? If he said we're working for the Forest Service and they've agreed to budget so much for the pumper to come out and pump this thing if we get the grant to build the deal. Then that shows that you have cooperation, which is another bonus point category and you have your sustainability.

Don French:

Well, I would say if you can't show you have sustainability I wouldn't approve the grant in the first place so. It shouldn't be a bonus it should be a criteria.

Doris Pulsifer:

Or an eligibility.

Don French:

Exactly. So do we take that sustainability out of there totally?

John Savino:

Ok. Let's go on to the next one please. Number four or five. No we had community SPORC, OHV,

Doris Pulsifer:

I've got that already.

Paul Katz:

She's already got that.

John Savino:

Ok, she's already got that.

Doris Pulsifer:

And then I just had two justifications on why you wanted to take out the local need and the education.

John Savino:

So, is everybody clear on what the bonus points so far are?

Doris Pulsifer:

So you only have three right?

John Savino:

We only have three total?

Doris Pulsifer:

First time applicants, OHV community/partner support, and successful completion of and administration of prior projects.

John Savino:

With that said, I can't say with that said. My wife said I couldn't say 'with that said.' I would like to entertain a motion to approve the three bonus point sections that we talked about and that Doris just explained to us.

Pete Pfeifer:

I'd like to make that motion.

John Savino:

Second? Somebody?

David Moore:

I'll second.

John Savino:

Ok, David Moore seconded it. All those in favor?

John Savino:

Aye, motion is approved unanimously. Ok, now we've got that done. Do we want to address any new bonus points that you can think of. Speak up or forever hold your peace for a year.

John Savino:

Ok, Jeff.

Jeff Gursh:

One of the things that's hard for an agency to do is plan long-range. So one of the grant's I've been writing and bringing to your board have been to build OHV areas that connect. So when we did the Boulders OHV area three years ago, the next one east that was Table Mesa, so now we've connected Table Mesa to the Boulders and the next phase would be to connect it to the Wickenburg area mountains. Could you have a category that said that phases of a connecting projects or projects that expand on the original one got a priority?

Paul Katz:

Just making coordination with adjacent federal, state and local lands

Jeff Gursh:

Expanding and connecting OHV projects across a region. So let's say if it was Havasu we'd have the new travel plan and you'd connect the different pieces which now are like individuals, you're now connecting different OHV projects or expanding on a existing one and continuing to build out.

John Savino:

How would you word that for Doris?

Doris Pulsifer:

Expansion of existing projects?

David Moore:

And or continuation.

Jeff Gursh:

Could it be grant projects? Expanding existing or previous grant projects?

John Savino:

Yes, because the wish is to go from border to border, from California to New Mexico and you go through different Forest Ranger districts and BLM and you connect it. Well, you put this much money into it to start with and you just wanted to do it but it's over a period of years so you have to take that into consideration.

Jeff Gursh:

Especially in lean times for our program when we don't have a lot of money from folks. If you actually got a bonus point for adding on to something you've already been approved for and successfully completed, that's a big deal.

Doris Pulsifer:

And I that's important. I think that if you're going to add this in there, expansion or continuation of successful previous projects.

Don French:

But I'm hearing a conflict here. Here on one thing we want to spread the money around the state and new projects and we want to give bonus for new projects and you also at the same time want to give bonus to adding on to existing projects.

John Savino:

Yes to all the above. When you have the money that's good. Where we're going to have issues come up is when we don't have the money, hopefully that never happens. When we don't have that amount of money then we look at it and in the past we'd had years where we said ok, State Parks has said we only have \$800,000 left then we look at it.

Don French:

I'm just saying we need to be careful because we have first-time applicants a bonus, a bonus

John Savino:

Yeah, but you also don't want to see something fall

John Savino:

So, how do we say this?

Doris Pulsifer:

I have expansion and/or connection of successful existing projects.

John Savino:

Ok. Any more discussion? I'd like to entertain a motion to pass that as one of our bonus points.

Don French:

I move to make that motion.

John Savino:

Second?

David Moore:

Second.

John Savino:

David seconds it. All those in favor?

John Savino:

Motion passes. Ok now we have four.

Doris Pulsifer:

I just have a quick question just for clarification. On the one on the first-time applicants is that applicants or is that applicants/new areas or is that going to be separate?

David Moore:

That's a whole different thing. First time applicants when we've opened it up.

Paul Katz:

And if people are interested in some remote area of the state let them apply.

Jeff Gursh:

And I don't know if it's probably covered under the paperwork and everything, would you want to say it was a qualified applicant or does that

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah, but if he's not qualified it's not going to get to this point so.

John Savino:

We have four bonus points.

Doris Pulsifer:

Do you want new areas too as a separate one, did you decide on that?

David Moore:

That's not unreasonable.

Doris Pulsifer:

A new opportunity

David Moore:

Provides previously unoffered opportunity.

Paul Katz:

It could be an existing applicant that wants to expand into a county that has nothing.

Doris Pulsifer:

We're talking about a new opportunity, a new area.

Pete Pfeifer:

It sounds reasonable

David Moore:

Yeah, this is the only thing that separates us from the other three for one, it has to be written into the grant and our real function as the representative of the people versus State Parks or anything else is to try to have access and opportunity for our constituents, I mean that's why I got on this group and I think if we're going to have something that represents ourselves and our constituents too, have a category for creates new opportunity or previously unused area or something like that I think is well worthwhile.

John Savino:

Jeff?

Jeff Gursh:

That's why I tied I put under my original one was new area or for first-time applicant. That way it you could get points for either one because you want new applicants to come in with projects and more likely if they're new there's probably a new area that they're going to have or someone introduces a new area to have projects in.

John Savino:

So, I'd like to amend

Paul Katz:

Just a motion to amend category for first-time applicants

John Savino:

Is that ok, first, are you okay with that?

Don French:

Yeah, we kind of have to define

Doris Pulsifer:

New opportunity

John Savino:

Let's settle that issue first. Are you ok with that. Ok. I'd like to entertain a motion to amend the first-time applicant priority to read, what? New applicant/new area, ok?

Doris Pulsifer:

Ok.

Paul Katz:

I'd like to make a motion to amend the first-time applicant category to include new areas.

Pete Pfeifer:

There you go, just like the judge said.

John Savino:

Don, you ok?

Don French:

Yeah, I second.

John Savino:

Don seconded. All those in favor?

John Savino:

The motion passed. The other one I just thought of and I'm going to through out to you, what do we have we have four now?

Doris Pulsifer:

Yes.

John Savino:

We have four categories. If we put out there a multi-use area, for use for atvs, whatever, if somebody comes in there as multi-use its for the hunters, the atvs, the jeeps, everything like this, should we throw that out there? Hey that's a consideration if it's a multi-use area? The Boulders, that's a multi-use area.

Paul Katz:

A multiple use project?

Jeff Gursh:

Pardon me. It will be a pretty easy one to get because almost all OHV trails are multi-use. So it would be and easy bonus for almost anyone to get if they're doing a staging area or a trailhead.

John Savino:

Except for when it comes into consideration is where it would be different is if it's a single-track trail or if it's a fifty-inch trail, then you know they're developing a section and we've had that in Prescott, they're developing and they want \$100,000 to develop three miles of fifty-inch trail. And I'm saying well but there's this other grant that's out there that's a multi-use and takes care of all those things. So should we have a category in there for

David Moore:

Nearly every grant we've ever awarded, you know, trail-wise, because they was never anything that stopped a birder or hunter or anything else from benefitting from any of those uses. So I think this would keep government agencies and law enforcement from getting bonus points, but almost any actual trail would qualify.

John Savino:

So what are you saying, you're in favor or not in favor?

David Moore:

Well, all I'm saying is if you have a trail and you make improvements to it, not only is it going to be good for OHV users for using it, the people that are bird watchers are going to be able to automatically use that trail. A person who is a hunter is going to be able to automatically use that trail. All those groups, every trail that you actually put down is going to be used by other people.

John Savino:

To a certain extent, yes, but if it's a single-track trail and it's only a single-track trail,

David Moore:

Is it a multi-use trail?

John Savino:

No, but I'm not talking about those multi-uses, I'm talking about the multi-use of the jeep going on that single-track trail or even an atv going on that single-track trail. I'm not thinking of that I'm on the line of the motorized vehicle use. Now whether it's a birder or whoever it is, I could care less.

David Moore:

That's the discussion we were having is how are we going to define multiple-use?

Jeff Gursh:

What you're looking for is does this grant address all of the OHV uses allowed on that trail, the majority of them. So if I build a jeep road, then every kind of OHV can use it. You'd like to give points for building a jeep road that everybody gets to use versus if I'm building just a single-track trail who only a single-tracker or a rock crawler, that's just for rock crawlers, that's one dimensional so they in my mind wouldn't get that extra bonus point. Does that make sense?

David Moore:

Here's the list from Trails 2000 of how they categorized all of these. You could use this list just for sake of consistency when you said well it has to meet four out of however many to get a bonus then maybe that would be.

John Savino:

Page 14 of the Trails 2005 basically says motorized trail activity, four-wheel drive driving, motorized trail biking, all-terrain vehicle riding, dune buggies and sand rails, snowmobiling, high clearance two-wheel driving, driving to sight see or view wildlife, driving to visit historical or archeological sites. So if they met any of the four?

David Moore:

Well you just established some number so it was broad use.

Paul Katz:

Is this multiple motorized trail activity?

David Moore:

Yes. Here's another list of a thing, it's on page 25 of the Arizona Trails 2005 which is maybe even a better list of users. Which reads, four-wheel driving, sightseeing, atv, it has competitive events,

John Savino:

I like that one better on 25. Do you see where we're going with this? Do you feel we should have that category? How do we want to write this so we can get it done, do we want to use this and say that they must and what we're doing is if



you take that stuff off this page of yours, off of page 25 and say they have to meet, what, three of those to be considered a multi-user in this area?

David Moore:

Three would be enough. This list is a little bit...big user groups now would be utv's, they're different from atv's which aren't on this, and extreme four-wheel driving. The rock crawlers are on this. There are a lot of those guys out there now. So, this list in 2005 didn't address those groups which have become much more popular in the last seven years. But, that kind of thing

John Savino:

I want, we all agreed on that we want a category for that, please somebody give a definition so we can get on with this?

Doris Pulsifer:

This is what I wrote. So bonus projects would be or bonus points would be awarded to projects that promote multiple, at least three multiple motorized use activities as defined in the Statewide Trails Plan.

John Savino:

Do we like that?

David Moore:

Yes.

John Savino:

Ok, let's go with that. Jeff, real quick.

Jeff Gursh:

I'm trying to think if you would want to say 'access' rather than 'promotes' because then it allows them on something? You want them to develop something to be on don't you?

John Savino:

Yes.

Doris Pulsifer:

So, projects that provide access for at least three

David Moore:

Or how about opportunity to have access.

Jeff Gursh:

Ok, opportunity to access is fine.

John Savino:

Provide opportunities for at least three motorized

Jeff Gursh:

Parking and staging areas it would allow, you could get the bonus for that, from a parking and staging area, for the access road to the trails and motorized loops for those things.

David Moore:

Right. Even graded roads going into some of these areas

John Savino:

And that's where we're going to end up with Game & Fish type thing where they write yes on everything and we have to decipher through them. If they come up to the thing and say that you know they're working on a trail, it's one-dimensional but they put down well you've got parking going in there you take motorhome in there, that's a different story. And that's something we do the research that I would hope well

David Moore:

You know, there is something that I think is very important that I've seen in various areas throughout the state that would be worthy of a bonus point. That is special projects or whatever where you have something that is really a good area to use, but it's held up because of a very minor thing. Either you have a land owner that owns a very small strip of land or you have a geographic thing that bars you from getting to a big area that could be used or something like that. Money that is spent on those things would open up where something is just waiting there to be used or had and spending the money on that sort of thing I think would be very worthwhile.

John Savino:

Before I get into that, ok, hold that thought. I have to get through with this one here. Priority number 5 is what?

Doris Pulsifer:

Projects that provide opportunities for at least three multiple motorized use activities as defined in the Statewide Trails Plan.

John Savino:

I'd like to entertain a motion to do what she just read as priority number 5. Anybody?

Don French:

So moved.

John Savino:

So moved by Don French. Second?

David Moore:

Second.

John Savino:

Seconded by David Moore. All those in favor?

John Savino:

Motion passed. Ok, now do we want a priority number 6? Are you asking for that or are you saying

David Moore:

I wanted the group do discuss it. And if we were going to have it it's one area that has rarely been addressed but that does come up.

Pete Pfeifer:

I think it's here under acquire.

John Savino:

It does come up, that's a good point to acquire. If it does come we could have it judged on. Ok? Are you satisfied with that?

David Moore:

I am.

John Savino:

Ok. So is there any other bonus point priorities? Is there anything else we want to throw out there. With that said, I'd like...

Paul Katz:

There's one other thing we need to address. How many points do you want to award for each thing?

John Savino:

What I'd like to do is can we break for lunch and then come back and do it or do you want to get it over now?

Ok we're going to get it done. We have the five bonus points that the OHVAG advisory group is going forward with. Now we have to assign points with that. What I'd like to know is that I noticed on these things that State Parks has five bonus points for each one straight across the board. AORCC has five bonus points straight across. Do we want to stay with that or do we want to set our priorities and say that new projects has more bonus points than something else? How do we want to do it? What I'd like to do is we don't have a Board here, are you guys ok with what we have or can we take a break? I'm just throwing this up here. Is there a way you can write those down real quick what those are, not the whole definition, but like new projects, have that and make a copy for each of us and then we can look at that and we could see all five of them out there and say if we want to put more bonus points for one than the other.

Don French:

First of all does anyone have a problems just sticking with 5 all the way across?

John Savino:

Are you ok with doing five across the board?

Pete Pfeifer:

I'm fine.

John Savino:

Are you ok with doing five, David?

David Moore:

I think so.

John Savino:

You think, or you know so?

David Moore:

Well, my only problem with the whole thing is that it never allows us a great flexibility in putting in input. I thought before there should be a bonus point you know for the OHVAG likes it category, but they're telling us we can't do that because it can't be written it.

Don French:

I agree with that. I've always thought it would be that way, but with this new system.

Pete Pfeifer:

Bryan said that we could, we should in fact...

John Savino:

We have this and then we have what our recommendation is for this grant. We're just doing a number system. It may rate 95 points, but we recommend against it but we'd better damn well have a reason why we recommend against it and that's where...

Doris Pulsifer:

The justification section.

Paul Katz:

With the change in directors and the Board, nobody knew exactly what you guys would be playing and now I think things are better defined and hopefully things will be done early enough and even earlier each grant cycle as we all get used to it so that there can be the lobbying effort whether its by OHVAG as a group or you as individuals or John Doe or Mary Roe out there in the community.

John Savino:

So with that said, you say just stay with the five points straight across the board? I'd like to entertain a motion to say across the board with these five categories we have for the OHVAG advisory group bonus points, keep it at five points each per priority.

Pete Pfeifer:

I'd like to make that motion.

John Savino:

Second by Don French. All those in favor?

John Savino:

Ok, we've approved that. Moving right along?

Doris Pulsifer:

Something I wanted you to be aware of on the AORCC recommendations, they made one more recommendation and that was that staff, and you guys can do what you want, but this is AORCC's recommendation, that staff review and rate future grant project applications and forward their recommendation to AORCC for consideration. So, in other words AORCC is saying they don't want to be involved in the actual rating.

John Savino:

Wait a minute!! This throws everything off. Now you're saying, we had a director sit right there and say 'I want all three independent things' now you're saying staff will make their recommendation

Doris Pulsifer:

No, review.

Paul Katz:

Every, all three of the groups said I've independently advised would like to know what everybody else is thinking up front. Let's just, it's not going to happen. That doesn't mean there can't be communications between OHVAG members and staff for technical

John Savino:

Then if there's a communication between AORCC and staff other than a technical suggestion, then there should be the same amount of communication between and OHVAG and AORCC because that's not fair if you have three different opinions going forward you need to have that.

Paul Katz:

My recommendation is there is technical advise going out regarding the grant process that goes to everybody, copies go to everybody.

John Savino:

And any personal, but here's another problem I have, Paul, with this whole process still and we're getting back to this, is that you have a director, and I really respect him and I think a heck of a lot of him, but he's sitting on two different things. He's the boss of staff and now he's sitting on the panel for AORCC and now two groups are sending their recommendation to State Parks Board and ours. There's something wrong with this picture. Now he says and I believe him, he said that our decision will weigh more than the others, but it doesn't sit well when you have that.

David Moore:

I agree. I thought the same thing really. If neither Game & Fish nor State Parks should be on AORCC.

John Savino:

Now we have a lot of grants that come forward to us, Paul, that come from Game & Fish, okay? And we have a lot of grants that come from State Land. You're telling me that in this whole picture, you've got a grant coming in from Game &

Fish, they're sitting on one of the decision-making bodies, now you have a decision-making body overseeing the whole thing and you have State Land involved in there.

Don French:

What you're saying can't be changed in this room and we'll have to live with what we can and

Doris Pulsifer:

And let me explain a little bit further where they're coming from. Keep in mind that AORCC would be was the advisory group that for years was advisory group for grants programs and this is what they're used to. Heritage Fund grants, Land and Water grants, all those grants they've reviewed in the past and the process was always because they felt that they don't have the time to go through all these grants and sit down and rate them and then go out and also look at the site to assess what the project is and then they make a determination. The way it was done in the past with AORCC and our other advisory groups who used to do the same thing. Anyway, the rating the actual rating was done with the team at State Parks and that recommendation would go forward to AORCC or whoever the advisory group was and the advisory group you know would either concur or not concur and there were times when they didn't concur and the applicants would come in and they'd make their presentation and they would and the group would either depending on staff's recommendation and the presentation that was made, they may change a recommendation so if the same if staff and the advisory group concurred, it would be one recommendation that would be forwarded to the Board. If there was a difference then two different recommendations would go to the Board and the Board would make the final recommendation. That's the process they're used to and that's the process they're forwarding their recommendation to the Board. That's what it's based on just so that you know.

John Savino:

Basically Don said we have to live with it until we see changes and we can't reinvent the wheel.

Doris Pulsifer:

We don't want to do it, you know we don't have time our boss isn't going to let us be going out to go and do these because most of them are working for cities and counties. My boss isn't going to let me go out and do project site visits for AORCC. So that's where they're coming from.

Pete Pfeifer:

Questioned the notice sent out regarding public meetings to announce new OHV Program Coordinator and direction for program.

John Savino:

I remember seeing that. Why?

Doris Pulsifer:

This was supposed to be discussed under Staff Reports. The director has requested that once we have our OHV coordinator on board and our planner on board to get public participation as far as what the OHV program should look like.

You know, what should the priorities look like, what should we be focusing on to pull it together. Also, in June there was some discussion I don't know if you remember when that gentleman show up and he had some sample off-road examples from New Mexico and or in May or whenever it was. Anyway, the Board thought it would be a good idea to get public input as to what are some of the priorities what are some of the ideas.

John Savino:

I'm having a problem with this, Doris. When you're saying public input...

Doris Pulsifer:

Well this is the Land Managers, everybody

John Savino:

But when you say get public input, it's one thing to saying the remember it's user pay user play dollars that you're talking about here and when you're talking about going out and getting public input and that public input is environmental flavor environmentalists and half OHV and you're taking that opinion there, that's not fair to the OHV community that has user pay user play money into this thing.

Doris Pulsifer:

But keep in mind it's State Parks responsibility is not just to the OHV community it's to the State of Arizona and to everyone and the recreation all kinds of recreation and how it impacts Arizona. And so they need to have input from the users, from the OHV community, from the Land Managers to make sure that everything's covered that the big picture is covered.

John Savino:

What's stated on there we should have, remember, we are State Parks experts and advisory group. That means as State Parks way before this coordinator even comes in contact with the outside community they should that person should be sitting there and talking to and getting the advice from OHVAG.

Pete Pfeifer:

Once again, this sounds like Bryan...

Doris Pulsifer:

We feel that the coordinator needs to be the person that gets out there is visible. We're hoping to have the OHV coordinator the first part of October so

John Savino:

Can I just say something here and I don't want to sound confrontational, this Off-Highway vehicle program, I know what Bryan said and I believe him, but I see this program going down the drain. When you're talking about we've gone from just having us and State Parks and submit grants and what have you, now we have AORCC involved, a total different entity involved now we're going out and reaching out to the community to get their ideas on things, our role in this thing is just diminished so much.

Doris Pulsifer:

And don't look at it that way because if you stop and think of the Statewide Trails Plan, that's input from all kinds of users

John Savino:

The 2005 trail plan was rolled over into the 2010 plan without getting any input from OHVAG.

Doris Pulsifer:

I can't comment on that as I was not in charge of that process.

John Savino:

Staff did not have the where-with-all, they didn't have the four people on staff to get OHVAG involved. So, without even coming to us on this, they rolled the OHV info over into the 2010 plan. All this info is so outdated. Bob said they took the 2005 and just moved it to 2010.

Pete Pfeifer:

I realize this might just be an opportunity to get the new guy out and meet people.

Kent Ennis:

Whenever these meeting come about, they are public meeting and you guys are required to be there.

**F. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETINGS AND CALL FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS** - Friday, November 2, 2012 at a location to be determined.

John Savino:

It looks like our next meeting date is November 2nd.

Don French:

What's happening here, aren't we supposed to be moving around the state?

John Savino:

We used to have a meeting one a year where we went out and visited a project site. Do we want to continue that? Do we want to try to go to Kingman in November? Okay, we will hold the November meeting in Kingman.

I would also like to add an agenda item for all meetings to have a report on specific projects that are on-going.

Doris Pulsifer:

How are you going to determine what projects you want reported on?

Don French:

Can we get a report on the status of existing projects? Whatever happened with the five UTV's we purchased for Game and Fish?

John Savino:

Kent, the funding we got from the Parks Board, the \$3000, that's just for travel to and from these meeting, right! How do we go about getting funding for somebody from our group to go out and see what is happening with the funding for projects?



Don French:

Can we put that on the agenda for next time?

John Savino:

We have to have it on the agenda, we can't talk about it now. Ok?

Paul Katz:

If you have any other thoughts for the agenda, it doesn't have to be by vote, you can just contact Doris.

John Savino:

Ok is there anything else? With that I'd like to entertain a motion to adjourn this meeting.

**G. ADJOURNMENT – MOTION** by Member Pfeifer, **SECOND** by Member Moore, **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Meeting is adjourned at 1:10 p.m..